Correspondence

OF THE LATE

GILBERT WAKEFIELD, B.A.

WITH THE LATE

RIGHT HONOURABLE

CHARLES JAMES FOX,

IN THE YEARS 1796....1801,

CHIEFLY, ON

SUBJECTS OF CLASSICAL LITERATURE.

LONDON.

Printed for

T. CADELL & W. DAVIES, IN THE STRAND:

SOLD ALSO BY W. BLACKWOOD, EDINBURGH;

AND M. KEENE, DUBLIN.

M DCCC XIII.

R. Watts, Printer, Broxbourne.

TO THE RIGHT HONOURABLE

LORD HOLLAND.

MY LORD,

I TAKE the liberty of inscribing to your Lordship this series of Letters, as well on account of your relationship to the eminent and excellent person who sustains a part in the Correspondence, as for the purpose of acknowledging your liberality in enabling Mr. WAKEFIELD's representatives to lay the Letters before the Public. Although it is manifest, from the easy, unlaboured style of Mr. FOX, in this Correspondence, that he wrote without premeditation, merely as the occasion prompted, I cannot suppose that any of the friends to his memory will, for that reason, object to its appearance from the press; but will

rather conceive, that the effusions of such a man have an additional value from that circumstance. That such is your Lordship's opinion, I conclude from your concurrence in the design; and, with sentiments of gratitude and sincere respect, I beg leave to subscribe myself,

MY LORD,

Your Lordship's most obedient

and obliged servant,

The Editor.

ADVERTISEMENT.

A NUMBER of Letters from the late Mr. Fox were left among Mr. WAKEFIELD's Papers, after his death; and have remained for some years at the house of his Widow, at Hackney. As they appeared to be written almost entirely on subjects of Classical Literature, it was thought, that if Mr. WAKEFIELD's share of the Correspondence could be recovered, the whole might form an interesting miscellany to Scholars. Fortunately, Mr. WAKEFIELD's Letters had been carefully preserved; and, on application to Lord HOLLAND, they were given up, in the most obliging manner, by this Nobleman, as a favour which he wished to confer on Mr. WAKEFIELD's family.

ADVERTISEMENT.

The high admiration which Mr. WAKEFIELD felt for the character of the illustrious Statesman, to whom he dedicated his beautiful edition of Lucretius, appears throughout this Correspondence: and the Friends of Mr. WAKEFIELD will feel no small gratification in finding, that the sentiments of esteem and respect were reciprocal.

London, June 1813.

LETTERS,



&c. &c.

LETTER I.

FROM MR. FOX TO MR. WAKEFIELD.

SIR, South Street, Dec. 17, 1796.

I RECEIVED, a few days ago, your obliging letter, together with the very beautiful book which accompanied it. The dedication of such an edition of such an author is highly gratifying to me; and to be mentioned in such a manner, by a person so thoroughly attached to the principles of liberty and humanity, as you, Sir, are known to be, is peculiarly flattering to me.

I am, with great regard,
Sir,
Your obedient, humble servant,
C. J. FOX.

LETTER II.

FROM THE SAME TO THE SAME.

SIR, St. Anne's Hill, Monday.

I RECEIVED, on Saturday, the second volume of Lucretius, together with a pamphlet of yours upon Porson's Hecuba, for which I beg leave to return you my thanks. I had received, some time since, your letter, announcing to me the present of the Lucretius; but delayed answering it till I got the book, which my servant had not then an opportunity of sending me, lest there might be some mistake, from your mentioning Park Street, instead of South Street, for my residence.

I have read with great pleasure your observations upon the Hecuba; but not having Euripides here, there are many points upon which I cannot form a judgment. One thing near the beginning has very much puzzled me: I mean the difficulty which you suppose some persons

would find in making a verse of

—— φιλιππον λαον ευθυνων ΔΟΡΙ,

which seems to me to be, supposing it to be part of an Iambic, perfectly regular; though by the word ΔΟΡΙ being put in capitals, I must suppose that there lies the irregularity. You then quote a verse of Lucretius, which you call "*consimilis*," in which there is an evident irregularity from the first syllable in "*remota*," which is usually short, being long.

Now I am writing on a subject of this sort, may I ask the favour of you, who I know have given your attention to Moschus and Bion, to explain three passages to me, which I do not understand?—

The first is in the Europa, v. 123, 124:

Οφρα κε νηων, κ.τ.λ.——

The second is in the Megăra, v. 70, 71:

—— επιγνωμων δε τοι ειμι

Ασχαλααν, κ.τ.λ.——

no ι subscript to ασχαλααν.

The third is in Bion's Adonis, the end of v. 74.

—— ποθεει και στυγνον Αδωνιν,

I have no other edition of Moschus and Bion here except Stephens's, in his Greek Poets, without a version and with few notes; but in regard to the first passage, I see Casaubon alters it to *οφρα μη ωην*, whose annotations upon the Europa I have in Reiske's Theocritus. This makes it intelligible, but is a violent alteration.

I feel it to be unpardonable in me to take advantage of your civility in sending me your books, to give you all this trouble; but I could not refuse myself so fair an opportunity of getting my doubts upon these passages cleared.

Before I conclude, give me leave to suggest a doubt, whether, in the 38th page of your Diatribe, it should not be "socios," instead of "socii;" or, if "socii" is what you approve, whether there should not be a "sint," to prevent harshness of construction?

I am, with great regard,

Sir,

Your most obedient servant,

C. J. Fox.

LETTER III.

FROM MR. WAKEFIELD TO MR. FOX.

SIR, Hackney, Aug. 29, 1797.

I AM highly gratified by your favourable acceptance of my Lucretius and Diatribe. I must beg of you to correct an oversight or two in the latter. At p. 18, ver. 669 of the Hecuba should not have been referred to; and the Σ', in p. 24, line 7, should be transferred to the beginning of the line.

That what I have advanced, in p. 5, should puzzle you, I must ascribe to an indistinctness in my representation of the point in discussion. What I mean is, that the final ν should never be expressed, but where a vowel follows; or, in other words, that this appendage was never employed as a device to lengthen a short syllable, but merely to prevent the harshness of an open vowel. Now, upon this principle,

the difficulty with the generality of readers would be the proper enunciation of such verses as that specified by me at the place. This difficulty, I maintain, will be none to those accustomed to pronounce Iambics with a suitable tone; by which I understand a tone similar to that with which all scholars, I believe, utter Anacreontics; and which certainly is necessary to all other verses, if we wish to distinguish them from prose:

Ουδ' ω | -λεσε μ | ε Ζευς——·

as if λεσεμμ': and δορι as if δὄρεῖ, with all the emphasis of a long syllable. In short, however, these niceties are scarcely to be conveyed intelligibly but by conversation, where the modes of education have been different, or novelties have been suggested by matured study. Certainly the common mode of reading, with a strange mixture of accent and quantity,

Arma *vīrum*que cano ——

as long as if it were *vires*, can never be

vindicated, and is well ridiculed through the following verses by a late writer:

> *Malo* me Galatea petit ——
> Tu ne cede *malis*, sed contra ——.

The passages, which you cite from Bion and Moschus, are considered, whether successfully or not, in my edition, which you will honour me by accepting; and I will carry a copy of it to your house, when I go to town on Thursday. Ασχαλααν is the Dor. or Æol. form of the infinitive mode for *ασχαλαειν*, not contracted: otherwise it had been *ασχαλᾳν*.

Certainly *socios*, in p. 38 of the Diatribe, would be better.

Sir! your apology for taking up my time by these inquiries might well have been spared: occupied as I am, I think it no interruption, but an exquisite pleasure, to comply with any wishes of Mr. Fox: nor could I reap a greater gratification from my studies, than the opportunity of discussing some of these topics in conversation with you; as it is possible that my elabo-

rate inquiries for some years past might occasionally strike out some new ideas on a subject which is still but imperfectly understood by the best scholars;—an assertion, which, I believe, my Notes on Lucretius will occasionally confirm.

I am, Sir,
With every sentiment of respect,
Your obedient servant,

GILBERT WAKEFIELD.



LETTER IV

FROM MR FOX TO MR WAKEFIELD

SIR, St Anne's Hill, Friday

I RECEIVED yesterday your very obliging letter, for which I return you many thanks, as well as for the Bion and Moschus, which I will tell my servant to take an early opportunity of sending down to me.

My puzzle arose from my supposing that, if you meant to refer only to the short syllable at the end of the verse, you would rather have asked, "How shall we pronounce verses that end with a short vowel?" of which there are so many, than have quoted one particular verse out of thousands; but I now perfectly understand you, though, I own, I do not think your reasoning quite conclusive. I conceive the reason for adding the final ν is not for the sake of pronunciation, which, in dead languages, is, and always must be, a matter of great uncertainty, but in order to preserve the rules of Prosody which appear generally to prevail among the Greek Poets. I know that, in Homer, and in other Poets who write Hexameters, it is not very unusual to see a short vowel become long by a particular position, though followed by a single consonant, and that consonant a mute; and sometimes even by an aspirated vowel, as φιλε ἑκυρε, and other instances. But, as far as my limited and uncertain

recollection goes, (very limited and uncertain indeed, since, except four tragedies of Sophocles last winter, I have not looked into the Greek Tragedians for twenty years and upwards,) I do not think that, in Iambic poetry, any short vowels, excepting those only where the final ν is used, are ever put in the place of a long syllable, unless followed by a ρ, or at least some liquid. Now, if this be true, and if those short vowels only, to which the final ν is occasionally added, do sometimes appear in such places, one cannot help suspecting that the final ν may in such cases have been used to lengthen the syllable, as in other cases it is (as we all agree) used to prevent the hiatus. Perhaps, in this inclination of my opinion, I may be warped by the prejudice of an Eton education; and, not having ever looked into any old Greek manuscripts, I do not know how far it is countenanced by any of them. I confess, however, that I should not admit the short vowels at the end, whether of Hexameters or Iambics, to be cases in point;

because it seems to be one of the most universal of those rules to which I before alluded, and which seem to me to prevail among the ancient Poets, that the last syllable of a verse may be always long or short, as is most convenient.

I am very sorry more encouragement has not been given to your Lucretius; but I am willing to flatter myself that it is owing to many people not choosing to buy part of a work till the whole is completed. Both the Latin and Greek elegiac verses, in the beginning of the second volume, have given me great satisfaction; but I should fear the inferior rank which you give to our own Country will not generally please; and certainly, in point of classical studies, or poetry, to which the mention of Apollo naturally carries the mind, we have no reason to place the French above us.

I am with great regard,

Sir,

Your obedient servant,

C. J. Fox.

LETTER V.

FROM MR. WAKEFIELD TO MR. FOX.

SIR, Hackney, Sept. 2, 1797.

EXCUSE this additional trouble, which a desire to explain one point induces me to give you; and to convey a request, that you will favour me by accepting, with the Bion and Moschus, two or three other books which I have directed my bookseller to send; and which may possibly amuse you, when nothing more interesting shall be at hand.

The final syllable of a verse is always long, whatever its real quantity, in consequence both of the pause and tone of voice, which are those of a long syllable; otherwise the verse would no more appear, and must be wholly vitiated by the reader, attentive only to the quantity of the syllable. That the old MSS. and first editors, who followed their MSS. acknowledge no final ν,

in the cases alluded to, is most certain: some later editors have partly seen, what I apprehend to be the truth in this respect; particularly Brunck and Musgrave; but, not discerning the true principle of the fact, fluctuate between the omission and insertion, in their practice, with great capriciousness. Mr. R. P. Knight, who is a profound and accurate Greek scholar, assented immediately to my notion, when I once proposed it to him in a casual conversation at the bookseller's: but I have found no other person who entered so readily into my conceptions. Indeed, it is my lot to enjoy the conversation of very few scholars, on account of the political complexion, and, let me add, theological complexion, too, of the times:

Fœnum habet in cornu longe fuge!

Will you give me leave, Sir, to say, that you scarcely appear well founded in your construction of my* Greek verses in the Preface? I think the context and the language alike prove, that my preference of

the French is merely in a political, not in their *literary*, character? And what can be more deeply sunk in ignominy than we are as a nation, in that view, at the present moment?

Will you excuse me, also, in recommending Lucretius to your perusal? I think antiquity has nothing comparable to his lib. iii. from ver. 842 to the end of the book: and the whole of his fifth book, both as a philosophical and poetical effort, is an admirable composition; not to mention any other portions of his poem.

I am, Sir,

With the highest sentiments of esteem and respect,

Your obliged servant,

GILBERT WAKEFIELD.

LETTER VI.

FROM MR. FOX TO MR. WAKEFIELD.

SIR, St. Anne's Hill, Wednesday.

I RETURN you many thanks for your letter of the 2d instant; and shall accept with great pleasure the books you propose sending to me.

I always understood the final syllable of a verse exactly as you do; but, for the purpose of my argument, it was necessary to mention the effect only, and not the cause, of the rule. Either your authority, or Mr. Knight's, much more both united, would be quite sufficient to convince me, upon a question relative to the Greek language. I only stated to you some arguments which occurred to me on the other side of the question, which, however, must lose all their weight, if the authority of the old manuscripts is any thing like so universally against them as you seem to

think. I see Stephens is inconsistent; but I think he oftener omits than inserts the final ν, which I had never observed till you started the subject.

I had no doubt but *political* wisdom and knowledge were what you meant in your epigram; but I cannot help thinking that 'Εωσφορος and Ηελιος lead the mind a little to poetry, or, at least, to knowledge in general; and that Γαι' Αυσονις and Αθηναι do not contribute to confine the sense to politics: in regard to which, I agree with you in thinking that no nation ever was sunk in more deep ignorance than we seem to be at present; for we are not only in the dark, but have a kind of horror of the light.

I have deferred reading Lucretius regularly through again, till your edition is completed; but he is a poet with whom I am pretty well acquainted, and whom I have always admired to the greatest degree. The end of the third book is perfectly in my memory, and deserves all you

say of it. I do not at present recollect the fifth quite so well.

I am going, in a few days, into Norfolk, for some weeks; and I shall come back by London, where I will call for the books which you are so good as to intend sending me.

I am, with great regard,

Sir,

Your obedient servant,

C. J. Fox.

LETTER VII.

FROM THE SAME TO THE SAME.

SIR, St. Anne's Hill, Tuesday, Jan. 30, 1798.

I HAVE received the third volume of your magnificent and beautiful Lucretius, for which I take the earliest opportunity of returning you my thanks. I cannot help flattering myself that, now the work is complete, it will be far more patronized than it has hitherto been: but it

must be allowed, that these times are not favourable to expensive purchases of any kind; and I fear, also, that we may add, that the political opinions we profess are far from being a recommendation to general favour, among those, at least, in whose power it is to patronize a work like yours.

I am at present rather engaged in reading Greek; as it is my wish to recover, at least, if not to improve, my former acquaintance (which was but slight) with that language: but it will not be long before I enter regularly upon your Lucretius; and when I do, if I should find any difficulties which your Notes do not smooth, I shall take the liberty of troubling you for further information; presuming upon the obliging manner in which you satisfied some doubts of mine upon a former occasion.

I am, with great regard,

Sir,

Your obedient servant,

C. J. Fox.

[*A Letter of Mr.* WAKEFIELD'S, *to which the following is an Answer, appears to be wanting.*]

LETTER VIII.

FROM THE SAME TO THE SAME.

SIR, St. Anne's Hill, Feb. 2, 1798.

IT is an instance of my forgetfulness, but I really thought I had acknowledged the receipt of the publications which you were so good as to send me. Excepting the Pope, which I have not yet looked into, I read the rest with great pleasure; and quite agree with you, that Bryant has made no case at all upon the subject of the Trojan war. I cannot refuse myself taking this opportunity of asking your opinion relative to the 24th Iliad, whether or not it is Homer's? If it is, I think the passage about Paris and the Goddesses must be an interpolation; and if it is not, by denying Homer the glory of Priam's expedition from Troy, and interview with Achilles, we take from him the

most shining passages, perhaps, in all his works.

I am, Sir,

Your obedient humble servant,

C. J. Fox.

P. S. Though I have not begun to read Lucretius regularly, yet I have *dipped* in it sufficiently to have no apprehension of quoting the line of Phædrus. I think the elegiac verses to the poet are very classical and elegant indeed; and, you know, we Etonians hold ourselves (I do not know whether or not others agree with us) of some authority, in matters of this sort.

LETTER IX.

FROM MR. WAKEFIELD TO MR. FOX.

[*The Note or Introduction to the following Observations, in answer to Mr.* FOX's *inquiry respecting the 24th Iliad, is supposed to have been mislaid.*]

Ver. 1. The first syllable in Αυτο is made long, in opposition to the practice of Homer in about a dozen places; and without another instance in the two poems. Homer too, unless two distinct parties are spoken of, uses in these cases ἑκαστος· and so indeed other good writers, in both languages: and on this I have touched somewhere in Lucretius. So that the full construction is: λαοι εσκ. ιεναι επι νηας, ἑκαστος (επι την ιδιαν νηα). There is, indeed, one or two instances of this deviation elsewhere, all tending to confirm my general hypothesis, which I shall hereafter mention. The Scholiast in Villoison, at ver. 6, mentions, that Ari-

stophanes, and others, thought part of this introduction spurious; viz. verses 6, 7, 8, 9; and they may be well spared.

Ver. 14. επει ζευξειεν is an illegitimate construction. We might read ζευξασκεν· but such an error is not easily accounted for, in so plain a case, from transcribers.

Ver. 15. The δ' is superfluous and impertinent; as Schol. Villois. also observes.

Ver. 28. Macrobius, Saturn. V. 16, beyond the middle, says, that Homer never mentions the Judgment of Paris. The perfect acquaintance of the old Grammarians with Homer's works indubitably evinces either the spuriousness of this passage, or an abjudication of this book from Homer's writings. The antient critics discarded verr. 20, 21. and from ver. 23—30 inclusive: see Villoison's Scholiast.

Ver. 44. This verse seems fabricated for the next, which has no pertinency here, and is transferred from Hesiod. Opp. et Dd. 316.

Ver. 60. No similar instance, perhaps,

in the poem, to the lengthening of και so situated; or to that of ΣΑ in ὁποσα; ver. 7.

Verr. 71, 72, 73, were rejected by some antient critics.

Ver. 79. ΜΕΙΛΑΝΙ. He uses this word and its relatives, perhaps, two hundred times; but never thus changes the first syllable.

Ver. 85, 86. Deemed spurious by the Antients.

Ver. 130, 1, 2, were rejected by old critics, for divers weighty and grave reasons.

Ver. 241. ΟΥΝΕΣΘ'—a word no where else found; as εξεσιην, ver. 235, once more only, in the Odyssey, though of a signification that might be expected to produce a more frequent usage. Κατηφονες too, v. 253, is ἁπαξ λεγομενον· and three or four others.

Ver. 293. εὖ only occurs in Il. Ξ. 427. which, in such a word of perpetual demand, is very singular.

Ver. 307. It is impossible that Homer, or a contemporary using the same language, could employ as a dactyl the three

first syllables of ειϛανιδων. The word ιδω, and all its compounds, had, in that age, another letter prefixed to it—the Æolic digamma, or Ionic Vau, which you please: by the latter name it still keeps its station in the Hebrew alphabet, and others, as the sixth in order; and its figure, a double Gamma, F, according to the former designation, in the Latin alphabet. Homer therefore could never be supposed to violate, in *one* instance, a propriety, which he had sacredly observed in 999, and make ειϛανϜιδων stand in a heroic verse. As the Æolians and Dorians, who spoke kindred dialects, are known to have been the first Græcian colonists in Italy, hence it is, that the Latin language is mere Æolian Greek engrafted on their indigenous tongue. On this account, the loss of Ennius, and the first Latin Poets, is more to be regretted, perhaps, than that of any other writers; because of the light they would have thrown on the Greek and Latin languages. Hence ιδεω, Fideo, i. e. *video*; ετος, *vetus*; ιτυλος,

vitulus; ἐντερον, *ventrem*; ιαχω, *voco*; ειλω, *volvo*; and an infinity of others. The Æolians also, wherever two vowels came together, inserted the digamma: hence ωον, *ovum*; *audii* vel *audivi*, &c.; δια, *diva*; σκαιος, *scævus*; νεος, *novus*; ναυς, *navis*, &c. Hence, by the common substitution of an *s* for the aspirate, as in ἑξ, *sex*; ἑπτα, *septem*, and ὑλη, *silva*; παων, *pavo*, βοος, *bovis*; and in an infinity of others. ΕισανFιδων, therefore, is the word either of another age, or another province. This is a curious and copious subject; and furnishes the true medium of correcting, adjusting, and discerning, Homer's poetry, from the clearest analogy and indisputable premises. No verse in Homer is genuine where a consonant precedes επος, ειπω, αναξ, ιδω, and many other words, which began with a digamma. A single page of any edition will shew how miserably incorrect we read him.' If we had not "fallen on such evil times and evil tongues," I should have exerted myself to give editions of all the Greek Poets; from

very ample materials now collected, and of the old Lexicographers: but—

—— aliis post me memoranda relinquo.

Ver. 320. Two words with digammas; one right measure, οἱ δε Fιδοντες, i.e. *videntes;* the other wrong, ὑπερ Fαστεος. (See verr. 327, 701.) From Fαστυ, *a city,* I suppose, came *vastus;* on account of the *size* of such places, and the *large* collection of men. Hence Virgil receives illustration, Æn. V. 119.

Ingentemque Gyas *ingenti mole* Chimæram,
Urbis opus——.

Ver. 325. τετρακυκλον. No similar instance, I believe, of a vowel shortened before those consonants in Homer; by far more chaste in this respect than succeeding Poets.

Ver. 337. αρ τις Fιδῃ. False quantity: amphimacer for a dactyl: see neighbouring verr. 332, 352, 366. to go no further.

Ver. 354. φραδεος νου Fεργα. Bad measure again: ver. 213, and others, are right in this respect. Strong presumptions of more than *one finger in this pie.*

Ver. 449. ποιησαν Fανακτι: unquestionably wrong; as αναξ is universally allowed to have the digamma in Homer's time. Hence *Phœnix*, φοινικοεις, *puniceus*, a *royal* colour; *purpura regum*, *purpurei tyranni*, *regali ostro;* Virgil, and Horace, with all others. The error is repeated in ver. 452. There are numerous faults of this kind in the common editions; but they may be corrected by the omission of the paragogic ν: as verr. 238, 555, 646, 733, and others.

But, to omit a more minute investigation of these niceties, let me give you, in few words, an outline of my theory respecting Homer.

What is so well known with respect to every malefactor tied up at Newgate; (most detestable, flagitious practice!) his "birth, parentage, and education; life, character, and behaviour;" are all utterly unknown of Homer? We are at liberty, therefore, to frame any hypothesis for the solution of the problem concerning his poems, adequate to that effect, without danger of contrave-

ning authentic and established history. Now ὁμηρος is an old Greek word for τυφλος: see Hesych. and Lycophr. ver. 422. I take *Homerus*, then, to have originated in the peculiarity of a certain *class* of men (i.e. blindness), and not in that of an *individual*. That bards were usually blind, is not only probable, from the account of Demodocus in the Odyssey, but from the nature of things. The memory of blind men, because of a less distraction of their senses by external objects, is peculiarly tenacious; and such people had no means of obtaining a livelihood but by this occupation. All this is exemplified in fidlers, &c. at this day. Now the Trojan war (the first united achievement of the Greeks) would of course become a favourite theme with this class of men, who are known to have been very numerous. Detached portions of this event, such as the exploits of Diomed, of Agamemnon, the Night Expedition, the Death of Hector, his redemption, &c. would be separately composed and sung, as fitted, by their

lengths, for the entertainment of a company at one time: and we find, in fact, that the parts of these poems are now distinguished, by scholiasts, grammarians, and all such writers, by these names, and not by books. These songs, bearing date demonstrably before the use of alphabetic characters in Greece, and when the dialect of the civilized parts of Asia (Ionia and Æolia) was uniform, could never be traced to their respective authors; and, in reality, we find from Herodotus, the first Greek historian, that no more was known of this *Homer*, nor so much, in his days (2, 3, 4, or 500 years after the event), as in our own. These songs of *blind men* were collected and put together by some skilful men (at the direction of Pisistratus, or some other person), and woven, by interpolations, connecting-verses, and divers modifications, into a whole. Hence ῥαψῳδια. Here we see a reason for so many repetitions: as every detached part, to be sung at an entertainment, required a head and tail piece, as necessary for an

intelligible whole: and hence we observe a reason for those unaccountable anomalies of measure, and the neglect of the Æolic digamma, from an ignorance of its power in those later times, whether from new insertions, or from alterations in the transmitted pieces, to effect regularity and consecution. This accounts also for the glaring disparity in some of the pieces: for nothing can be more exquisite than what you so justly admire, the interview of Priam and Achilles; and nothing more contemptible than the whole detail of the death of Hector, and the reconciliation of Agamemnon and Achilles. You are expecting a noble exhibition of generosity and magnanimity on both sides, and you are put off with a miserable tedious ditty about *Atè*.

It is probable, from various particulars, that, perhaps, as good a poem, if the opportunity had not been lost (and the preservation of the Iliad and Odyssey, under all circumstances, is nearly miraculous), might have been transmitted on the subject of two

other events, which equally engaged the notice of the early Greeks,—the Theban war, and the Argonautic expedition. But we have no remains of these exploits, but in the Tragic writers, the spurious Orpheus, and the Roman Epic writers, except the entire poem of Apollonius Rhodius on the latter subject.

LETTER X.

FROM MR. FOX TO MR. WAKEFIELD.

SIR, St. Anne's Hill, Feb. 16, 1799.

I SHOULD have been exceedingly sorry, if, in all the circumstances you mention, you had given yourself the trouble of writing me your thoughts upon Homer's poetry; indeed, in no circumstances, should I have been indiscreet enough to make a request so exorbitant: in the present, I should be concerned if you were to think of attending even to my limited question respecting the authenticity of the 24th Iliad, or to any thing but your own business.

I am sorry your work is to be prosecuted; because though I have no doubt of a prosecution failing, yet I fear it may be very troublesome to you. If, either by advice or otherwise, I can be of any service to you, it will make me very

happy; and I beg you to make no scruple about applying to me: but I do not foresee that I can, in any shape, be of any use, unless it should be in pressing others, whom you may think fit to consult, to give every degree of attention to your cause. I suppose there can be little or no difficulty in removing, as you wish it, the difficulty from the Publisher to yourself; for to prosecute a Printer, who is willing to give up his Author, would be a very unusual, and certainly a very odious, measure.

I have looked at the three passages you mention, and am much pleased with them: I think "curalium," in particular, a very happy conjecture; for neither "cœruleum" nor "beryllum" can, I think, be right; and there certainly is a tinge of red in the necks of some of the dove species. After all, the Latin words for colours are very puzzling: for, not to mention "purpura," which is evidently applied to three different colours at least—scarlet, porphyry, and what we call purple, that is, amethyst,

and possibly to many others—the chapter of Aulus Gellius, to which you refer has always appeared to me to create many more difficulties than it removes; and most especially that passage which you quote, "virides equos." I can conceive that a Poet might call a horse "viridis," though I should think the term rather forced; but Aulus Gellius says, that Virgil gives the appellation of "glauci" rather than "cœrulei" to the *virides equos,* and consequently uses *virides,* not as if it were a poetical or figurative way of describing a certain colour of horses, but as if it were the usual and most generally intelligible term. Now, what colour usual to horses could be called *viridis* is difficult to conceive; and the more so, because there are no other Latin and English words for colours which we have such good grounds for supposing corresponding one to the other as *viridis* and *green,* on account of grass, trees, &c. &c. However, these are points which may be discussed by us, as you say, at leisure, if the system

of tyranny should proceed to its maturity. Whether it will or not, I know not; but, if it should, sure I am that to have so cultivated literature as to have laid up a store of consolation and amusement, will be, in such an event, the greatest advantage (next to a good conscience) which one man can have over another. My judgment, as well as my wishes, leads me to think that we shall not experience such dreadful times as you suppose possible; but, if we do not, what has passed in Ireland is a proof, that it is not to the moderation of our governors that we shall be indebted for whatever portion of ease or liberty may be left us.

I am, Sir,

Your most obedient servant,

C. J. Fox.

LETTER XI.

FROM THE SAME TO THE SAME.

SIR, St. Anne's Hill, Feb. 23, 1798.

NOTHING, but your stating yourself to be in some degree at leisure now, could justify my troubling you with the long and, perhaps, unintelligible scrawl which I send with this. I most probably have shewn much ignorance, and certainly some presumption, in seeming to dispute with you, upon points of which you know so much, and I so little: all I can say in my defence is, that disputing is sometimes a way of learning.

I have not said any thing yet upon the question which you seem to have thought most upon—whether the Iliad is the work of one, or more authors? I have, for the sake of argument, admitted it; but yet, I own, I have great doubts, and even lean to an opinion different from yours. I am

sure the inequality of excellence is not greater than in "Paradise Lost," and many other poems written confessedly by one author. I will own to you, also, that in one, only, of the instances of inequality which you state, I agree with you. Atè is detestable; but I cannot think as you do of the death of Hector. There are parts of that book, and those closely connected with the death of Hector, which I cannot help thinking equal to any thing.

It is well for you that my paper is at an end, and that I have not the conscience to take a new sheet.

Your humble servant,

C. J. Fox.

Inclosed in the above.

Ver. 1. I agree in the objection to λυτο, and am not satisfied with Clarke's account of it; and, besides, there is something of a baldness, or of an affected conciseness, in

beginning a narration in those words, very unlike Homer. or, if you please, the 'Ομηροι. 'Εκαστοι for ἑκαστος is so small an error in writing, that it affords little ground for an objection, or even a doubt.

Ver. 6, 7, 8, 9, may be left out, or not, without affecting the authenticity of the book.

Ver. 14. I have not skill enough in the language to judge whether your objection to ζευξειεν be unanswerable; but I know no answer to it.

Ver. 15. The δ' is easily to be got rid of, and is one of the most natural mistakes in the transcribers.

Ver. 28. Macrobius's authority appears to me to be decisive, to prove that this passage is an interpolation since his time; and consequently destroys the argument built upon this passage against the book itself, upon other parts of which he has commented.

I do not know why the antient critics discarded ver. 20 and 21; nor do I think it

material whether they are retained or not.

Ver. 44 & 45, I agree, had better be away; but I know not whether there be any authority for discarding them.

Ver. 60. The lengthening of και in this place does appear to me very awkward; and, *if* there are no similar instances, must be an error: besides, the mythology of this passage is quite new to me: I mean Juno's having nursed Thetis.

As to the σα in ver. 70, I cannot help thinking there are many instances of syllables being lengthened in such situations; and, at any rate, it is one of the verses which you say some critics reject. Probably from want of memory, but I have some doubt about the word ὁποσα being a Homeric word: it is certainly much oftener ὁσα.

Ver. 71, 72, 73, I had rather were away; but, as I said before, I do not know the authority for leaving them out.

Ver. 79. Μειλανι is indeed a most suspicious word, and I have nothing to say for it.

Ver. 85, 86. I cannot see any objection to them; but, as before, I do not know the authorities or arguments for or against them.

Ver. 130, 131, 132, appear to me to be much in Homer's style; and I should certainly be for keeping them, if there is nothing against them but Eustathius's saying the passage was rejected by some of the Antients.

Ver. 241. Ουνεσθ' always puzzled me; nor do I know rightly what it means. I do not quite agree in thinking εξεστιη of such a signification as to make the rare use of it very surprising. As to εὗ, it is certainly used once more than you are aware of —ει πως εὗ πεφιδοιτο, (I believe in the Υ,) and therefore may possibly be oftener. In the place I quote, it means *sui*, not *cujus*, as here; and so it means *ejus* in the Ξ. 427: but this, I think, makes no difference.

Ver. 307. The three first syllables of εισαυιδων, or, as you write it, εισανϜιδων, cannot (as you say, and I believe Knight says the same) have been used by the 'Ομηροι as

a dactyl; and no verse can be a genuine Homeric verse, where the digamma is (if I may use such an expression) *slighted* in that manner. I must be excused, till further informed, from giving an unqualified assent to this proposition. If the proportion of instances on one side and the other were, as you seem to state, nine hundred and ninety-nine to one, I should not hesitate; but, I confess, I suspect this to be far from the true state of the fact. I have not looked into the Iliad since I received your letter, except to the Ω; but I recollected immediately four instances—three of them in one book, the Γ, and one in the Α. In Α, οφϱ' ἱλασσωμεθ' ανακτα: in Γ, ει τις ιδοιτο: and two in one line—

Ου ποτε γ' ωδ' Οδυσηος αγασσαμεθ' ειδος ιδοντες:

besides, εϱγ' ειδυια is familiar to my ear, though I do not know where particularly to look for it.

In the Odyssey, there are three instances in the space of fifty lines in the Λ, in the verses 521, 549, 560. The first of these three

has, I confess, the air of a spurious line; the second might be remedied by taking away a δ', but without the δ' the construction would be hard, and unlike Homer: but the third cannot well, I think, be altered; and it is the more remarkable, on account of the digamma being respected in the same line, δευρο αναξ ἱν' επος, &c. There is also, in the Odyss. N, the word προσιδωνται, which, I should conceive, could hardly be altered to προϊδωνται without changing the sense. If these which I have mentioned were *all* the instances, I admit they would not much signify: but as those from the Iliad have occurred to me *memoriter* only, and those from the Odyssey from a very slight investigation of a very small part of the poem, I cannot help supposing there may be found many hundreds of them; so that I can hardly conceive the proportion to be any thing like what you suppose,—especially as all the cases of the paragoges preceding the digamma make neither for one side nor the other, but must be thrown

out of the question, as perfectly neutral. I should hardly think you would (and I am sure Knight would not) consent to take away from Homer, and give to his collectors, or joiners, or botchers, the Γ and the Ω of the Iliad, and the Λ of the Odyssey; and this to make the cobler superior to the original artist or artists. According to your system, you may possibly say, that those parts where the digamma is uniformly respected were written by older poets; those where it is sometimes slighted, by more modern: but what if it should appear to be nearly equally respected and slighted in the different parts of the poem? Now my hypothesis, if I dared to form one, would be this; and (every man loves his own best,—την αυτου φιλεει και κηδεται) it appears to me more reasonable than any that I have yet heard. I suppose this digamma, at one period at least, not to have had the decided sound which belongs in general to consonants; and, consequently, that the poets of that

period, the 'Ομηροι, thought themselves at liberty to sound it more or less, and consequently to treat it in the manner most convenient to their verse. If it was sounded sometimes more, and sometimes less, it might naturally happen that, in process of time, one dialect, viz. the Latin, might erect it into a decided consonant, *v*; and others, viz. the Attic, &c. might wholly drop it. Thus, in modern Italian, in the word *uovo*, an egg, the *u* is pronounced at Florence in a manner very difficult to be imitated by foreigners, and which makes it appear to be something between a vowel and a consonant; but in other parts of Italy, where the language is corrupted, it is in some wholly dropped, and the word is pronounced *ovo*; in others, it is made a complete consonant, and sounded *vovo*. This may be, and probably is, a fanciful theory of my own; but, I own, I feel great reluctance to cut the Iliad and Odyssey to pieces, and to give them, not only to different authors, but different ages. I do not know whether

Hesiod is, in your opinion, a contemporary with Homer; but, if he is, I think that in his Εργα και ʽΗμεραι there is απ᾽ εργου χειρας ερυκοι: and εργον is, I suppose, one of the words with the F.

Ver. 320. I doubt the derivation of *vastus* from αστυ: though I believe αστυ to have been written Fαστυ, because ανα αστυ, ποτι αστυ, are so common: and surely the comparison of a large vessel to a town is too natural, when it is meant to exaggerate its size, to make it necessary to have recourse to any particular derivation.

Ver. 325. There are certainly some other instances of a vowel short before τρ, though, I believe, not many. The first syllable of Πατροκλος is short in more instances than one; but the instance of a proper name is not, perhaps, quite a fair one; as Homer might take the same liberty, in such cases, as the Tragedians did afterwards, which you have noticed and accounted for, I think, in the best manner. The word προτραποιμην is at the end of a

verse in Odyss. M. ver. 381. Προσηυδα, &c. are often at the end of lines, and consequently the syllable before πρ short: but these you may not think cases in point, because in them the vowel and the consonants are in separate words; but I do not think the Greeks in general attended much to that distinction.

Ver. 337. I have said enough at least upon the F; I fear, too much: but I must just observe, that the being some times right, and others wrong, does not prove two fingers in the pie, because they are sometimes right and wrong in the same verse, which probably was all made by one author.

LETTER XII.

FROM MR. WAKEFIELD TO MR FOX.

SIR, Hackney, Feb. 25, 1798.

THE best argument against Homer, and for my hypothesis, appears in my general observations, prefixed to Pope's Odyssey, in the edition which I prepared for the Booksellers; and of which I have but one copy for myself, or I should long since have requested your acceptance of the work. Certainly, if any thing like your opinion, with respect to the digamma, could be established, the early Greek Poets, instead of meriting the encomiums of all antiquity for their correctness, must be deemed the most capricious and irregular of all writers; and emendatory criticism upon them can be modelled by no rules of analogy whatever: whereas their modes of expression are so precise and congenial, that the direct contrary appears to be the truth.

The detached lamentations of the several characters at the end of Il. Ω. have a very formal appearance; and much the air of an attempt from different bards to shew their skill upon the same subject. In collections of Greek epigrams, and in some works of the later Sophists, you find compositions introduced with such commas as these: " What sort of exclamation Achilles would use on the death of Patroclus?" &c. and then follows a specimen of the author's talents in that way.

The Shield of Hercules, in Hesiod, is one of those detached pieces of poetry, such as I suppose the Iliad to be formed of, remaining to us from the highest antiquity; and quite equal to any thing in Homer with which it can properly be compared. His Theogony, too, in versification and language, is perfectly similar to the Iliad; so that their imitation of existing models is almost an inevitable conclusion: and the probability is, that numberless pieces of this kind were existing among the antient

bards of Greece, but have been lost, partly from the negligence of succeeding times, and partly from the want of alphabetic characters.

But before those corrections of Homer, on the principle of the Æolic digamma, could be prosecuted, some general rules must be laid down; as follow:

I find, suppose, in reading the Theogony of Hesiod, that the digamma is regarded seventy times, and disregarded thirty. (What I am stating is generally the fact, though the numbers may not be perfectly in ratio.) Out of these thirty irregularities, I find ten rectified in the various readings; but I consider that not one MS. in a thousand of Hesiod has come down to our times. I argue, then, for the probability of a rectification of all the thirty, with more MSS. from the general principle of their method and correctness as writers. Again: this circumstance of the digamma has been so unknown to later ages, or at least disregarded by them, that reporters of MSS. it

is most certain, have neglected a declaration of those little varieties, which would settle these controverted passages, from an opinion of their unimportance. The same ignorance or inattention would lead the transcribers readily to fill up these chasms, as violations of measures, or to leave unnoticed these niceties, as things trivial and unessential; all which may be shewn, to the very highest degree of probability, from innumerable instances: so that, instead of wondering at thirty anomalies, we must rather be surprised that they have not been much more plentiful. In short, there is scarcely an instance of a learned construction, or a more exquisite peculiarity of numbers, but some corruption or other may be traced in the various readings of MSS. or the importunities of modern editors. Now to your particulars.

Your instance from Il. A. 444. has been corrected by Dawes, Misc. Crit. p. 146, from the Florentine edition, with general approbation, ὡς ἱλασομεσθα ανακτα: and all the exceptions

that relate to αναξ are noticed by him, and mostly well and easily corrected. But all niceties of this kind were so uniformly obliterated by later scribes and editors, that, in the present wreck of MSS, an emendation, simple and convincing, is often beyond the reach of sagacity, and, in many cases, quite impossible. In Γ. 453. laying aside the digamma, the tenses are incongruous, and the construction ungrammatical. What is required, the Scholiast indicates sufficiently: ει τις ΙΔΟΙΤΟ] ει τις ΕΘΕΑΣΑΤΟ: "If he *had seen* him, he would not have concealed him:" not, "If he *could see* him." Besides, τις is inelegantly repeated. Now, except other MSS. and the first editions (for these studies are not to be cultivated duly without very large libraries at hand) give some further hints, I see nothing better than the following attempt: for the verb absolutely requires here αν or κε:

Ου μεν γαρ φιλοτητι γ' εκευθανον, ει ΚΕ ΙΔΟΝΤΟ:

which will satisfy both measure and construction.

Ver. 224 can occasion no difficulty, as a most barbarous and impertinent interpolation; and I see, accordingly, a mark of exception prefixed to it by the antient critics in Villois. Homer. Εϱγ' ειδυια, and its parallels, where α must be lost, (for δ' before the digamma must be conceded) may be settled by writing εϱγα ιδυια· as Il. Υ. 12. ιδυιῃσι πϱαπιδεσσι. No question but we should write πϱοϊδωνται in Od. N. 155. *prospicient, See at a distance:* compare ver. 169. Hesiod. Scuti Herc. 385, where one scribe could not be easy without attempting to substitute πϱοσιδωνται: otherwise there is an end of all probability in criticism, grounded on the usage and accuracy of writers. But, as I said, before some particular specimens can be acceptable, the reader must be prepared by general positions, and a detail of undisputed specimens on good authority: and this were a work of time and labour. I have by me materials

for an important, and, as I think, interesting attempt of this nature, not less allied to philosophy and history, than criticism; and materials, indeed, for correcter editions of most of the Greek and Roman Poets; but, as I can never pretend to execute any thing much better than my Lucretius, till the burden of that publication is a good deal more alleviated, my pen never meddles with such subjects again, to the end of my days.

Sir! my former apologies must serve me for stopping more abruptly than I could wish, and for subscribing myself here, with every sentiment of respect,

Your obedient servant,

GILBERT WAKEFIELD.

LETTER XIII.

FROM MR. FOX TO MR. WAKEFIELD.

SIR, St. Anne's Hill, March 16, 1798.

I DEFERRED answering your last Letter, in order to have time to read over attentively some part of Homer, with a view to the digamma. I have read, since I wrote last, ten books of the Odyssey, from Ξ to Ψ inclusive; and find in them eighty-five instances where the digamma is neglected. It is true that, in many of these, the fault, if it be one, is easily corrected; but then the question arises, if the instances are so numerous, What reason have we to think that there is any error, or occasion for correction? I will admit, however, that the result of my attention to the subject is, that with the old poet, or poets, whom we call Homer, the natural and common course seems to have been, to consider words

beginning with the Ϝ like words beginning with a consonant; but then the numerousness of the instances to the contrary, and, above all, the circumstance of those instances being spread pretty equally over those books to which I have attended, raise great doubts in my mind, whether words beginning with Ϝ were not occasionally considered as words beginning with a vowel. Nor can I agree that this supposition would make the old writers so capricious as you seem to think: for, in fact, it only supposes them to have treated the digamma as unquestionably they treated the aspirate ʿ; before which short vowels are sometimes cut off, sometimes left standing; long vowels and diphthongs sometimes shortened (though, by the way, very rarely), sometimes left long; and syllables ending with consonants sometimes retain the shortness natural to them, at other times not. What you say upon the three instances I quoted *memoriter* from the Iliad is very satisfactory, especially as the alteration to

ἱλασομεσθα is, you say, warranted by an old edition: and, indeed, the whole of this question must at last be decided by a reference to such editions and to manuscripts; in regard to both which I am uncommonly ignorant, never having read Homer in any other editions than the Glasgow and Clarke's. I have indeed occasionally looked at a very few passages in H. Stephens's edition of him among the Greek Poets; but, with this single exception, I know nothing of any other text but Clarke's (for the Glasgow is a transcript from him), nor of any other Comments or Scholia than those which he has cited. What you have said has raised in me an ardent curiosity to look into the old editions; and I shall endeavour, in the course of the year, to visit some libraries where there are collections of them. The lamentations in the Ω of the Iliad are certainly rather formal in the manner in which they are introduced, unless one supposes them to be a part of a sort of funeral ceremony. In regard to the short syllable

before the mute and the ρ, I have found but one instance (proper names excepted) in the ten books I have just read; and in that there seems to be some error: the word is δακρυοισι in Od. Σ. ver. 172; but I recollect, in other parts of Homer, to have read, more than once, ἀδροτητα και ἥβην. ΑΝδροτητα, as I believe it is sometimes written, would only increase the difficulty. I am sensible that if we consider the diphthongs οι and αι as short syllables, the number of instances I have quoted of the neglect of the F will be something (not greatly) diminished. Reiske, in his Notes on Theocritus, is positive these syllables are sometimes short, and were so used by Homer; and I suspect that all you, who think the attention to the F the criterion of authenticity, are of his opinion; else the famous passage in Il. Υ. quoted by Longinus for its sublimity, must be given up, on account of

—— εκ θρονου ἀλτο και Fιαχε.——

I am very much concerned at your Lucretius meeting with so little encouragement

as you say; and I feel the more, because I cannot help thinking that part of the prejudice, which occasions so unaccountable a neglect, is imputable to the honour you have done me by the dedication of it—an honour, I assure you, that I shall always most highly value.

I am, Sir,

Yours ever,

C. J. Fox.

LETTER XIV.

FROM MR. WAKEFIELD TO MR. FOX.

SIR, Hackney, March 7*, 1798.

It is most certain, that anomalies and inconsistencies of all kinds are much more frequent in the Odyssey than the Iliad, from a cause which is in favour of an hypothesis that receives countenance in

* Although some mistake appears in the date of Letter XIII, or XIV, this of Mr. Wakefield's is evidently an answer to the preceding of Mr. Fox.

proportion to our ability of approximation to antient sources; i. e. the fewer transcripts of that poem compared with the Iliad, on account of the less interest which all ages have taken in its favour: for it is an acknowledged position, that those authors are most corrupt of which the fewest MSS. have been preserved. Now, where old editions and MSS. enable us to rectify so many of these irregularities without violence, the presumption is very strong in our favour, from the great antiquity of Homer: for MSS. five times as old as any now in being, would be modern in comparison of the oldest MS. of Virgil, and most other authors. I have marked in my margin all the violations of the theory of the digamma, but have never numbered them. I should suppose, that many of your instances would be accommodated by an omission of the final ν, or some other simple process; remembering always, that the little words δ' and τ' form no exceptions; and such sounds were not harsher, I presume,

than *βδελυρος*, *γδουπησε*, and some others. Nor must we forget how all traces of antiquity, in numerous other instances, have been so obliterated by the prepossessions and ignorance of successive transcribers through many ages, as to leave the truth in some cases absolutely irrecoverable: of which, even with relation to Latin orthography, I have given many instances in my Notes on Lucretius. What you urge upon the variations of quantity from the influence of the aspirate seems very pertinent: but I am partly inclined to believe these discordances to be imaginary, and the offspring of an inaccurate attention to specific instances. I do not despair of pointing out reasons for these variations from general rules; but these studies are really in their infancy, and will continue so, till better forms of government leave the human race at large more leisure to cultivate their intellects. Besides, we may well believe, from numerous deductions, a theory to be legitimate; though, in the midst of so much

darkness and inconvenience, and after so long an interval, no sagacity be equal to a satisfactory solution of every contradiction: but, in truth, nothing can be done with any proper and adequate nicety in this way without the First Editions, and a great variety of them; in which respect I labour under very discouraging impediments; though, all circumstances considered, I have but little doubt of being able to claim for myself the merit of having collected, without gross imprudence or injustice to my family, from mere personal self-denial of reasonable indulgences, considering my income, the best comparative library of any man in this country. Bentley's note on Callim. Hymn. Jup. 87. has long since set at rest the old controversy on the quantity of the diphthongs *οι* and *αι*, with all those who do not, like Reiske, bid defiance to all quantity whatsoever: and yet Primatt, in his book on Accents, seems never to have met with that note of Bentley. The instances of syllables short,

in Homer, before two consonants of any kind, I meant to state as exceedingly few, much fewer than in any author after him. To the best of my recollection, Dionysius, in his Periégesis, approaches nearest to Homer's purity in this peculiarity of smooth versification.

Most of the specimens of the violated digamma in *ιαχω* may be readily and naturally adjusted: your example from Il. Υ. 62. is of a very untractable quality; and whatever assurance we may feel, in our own minds, of the general validity of a theory, it were very unreasonable to expect acquiescence from a neutral reader in an emendation not recommended by the utmost facility and probability. What I have to offer here, is this: the Schol. in Villois. tells us, that some read *ωρτο*; I say, perhaps *ωρετο* should be substituted, which is a word of Homer's also: but a too ready persuasion that it was a variety for *ἁλτο* instead of *ιαχε* would soon turn *ωρετο* into *ωρτο*. Suppose, then, — *εκ θρονε ἁλτο και ωρετο*—" *leapt* from his

throne in great *bustle* and *perturbation*."
Now no word whatever could better represent Virgil's *trepident* in the parallel passage, than this: whereas ιαχε has, in the Roman, at present no counterpart. Further: Eustathius says on the passage, Δεισας δ', εκ θρονε ἀλτο και ὑπερθορεν η ιαχε. If I were not in quest of a particular object, I should say, that η and και must be transposed; and then the common reading is right: but you must allow me the advantage of this variety; from which I have surely as much right to reason, as another man can have to an arbitrary correction against the copies. If the copies of Eustathius be correct, it is demonstration that some word equivalent to ιαχε (which, in that case, from a marginal gloss, has insinuated itself into the text) is corrected in ὑπερθορεν· which the measure rejects. Now a word not essentially different from the former ωρτο and this of Eustathius, either in letters or enunciation, would be most probable. Suppose, then,

——— εκ θρονε ἀλτο και ΩΡΥΕ:

Made a loud bawl. Now the Lexicons would make you believe, that this word is only used of beasts, dogs, and wolves (See my Notes on Bion, i. 18.); but Antip. Sidon. epig. 8. employs it of the roaring of the *sea;* and Pindar, Ol. ix. 163. of a *man.*

Sir, it gives me real concern, that you should suppose my notice of you in my Lucretius should have proved injurious to the reception of that work. Believe me, nothing can be more unnecessary and unsubstantial than your solicitude on this head. My former publications were alone a proof, from *fact,* of what I allege; which makes me the more decisive in my assertion. I am satisfied, that no man on earth, at all similarly situated, was ever less obnoxious to his political antagonists than you are: and nothing but a persuasion in me, rooted on long and attentive observation, that you had qualities which secured you from the disaffection of every heart tolerably humanized, could have induced me to pay you that trivial token of my respect with such

perfect acquiescence; a token of respect which I shall contemplate, I know, with increasing satisfaction to the end of life. I am glad, however, that I can gratulate you on escaping the inauspicious omen of the Scriptures: "Woe! unto you, when *all* men speak well of you:" and yet I should not be surprised, if the times mend so much, and such opportunities for a fuller and freer display of yourself present themselves, as actually to excite some *apprehension* and *mistrust* in me in consequence of the *universal* and *unqualified* approbation of the world. When that takes place, perhaps, I may set my wits at work to find out some erratum in the copies of that verse. At present, I must own that such solicitude is not absolutely necessary.

But the copies of my Lucretius are not numerous; and I know it must make its way in time against all personal and political opposition, especially when known on the Continent. Mr. Steevens, editor of Shakspeare, who, though a friend of mine, can

scarcely endure one of my opinions; an excellent classical scholar, and a most severe censor; who detected, I think, 900 errors in the Heyne's Virgil, lately published at London, and *corrected* by Porson; pronounced, in my hearing, at a Bookseller's, last week, my large-paper Lucretius to be the most magnificent and correct work of its kind that had yet appeared. One was ordered for the King's Library last week.

I remain, Sir,

Your most obedient servant,

GILBERT WAKEFIELD.

LETTER XV.

FROM MR. FOX TO MR. WAKEFIELD

SIR, St. Anne's Hill, March 1, 1799.

Although I am wholly without any resources, even of advice, and much more of power, to offer you my services upon the present occasion, yet I cannot help trou-

bling you with a few lines, to tell you how very sincerely concerned I am at the event of your trial.

The liberty of the press I considered as virtually destroyed by the proceedings against Johnson and Jordan; and what has happened to you I cannot but lament therefore the more, as the sufferings of a man whom I esteem, in a cause that is no more.

I have been reading your Lucretius, and have nearly finished the second volume; it appears to me to be by far the best publication of any classical author: and if it is an objection with some persons, that the great richness and variety of quotation and criticism in the Notes takes off, in some degree, the attention from the Text, I am not one of those who will ever complain of an Editor for giving me too much instruction and amusement.

I am, with great regard,
and all possible good wishes,
Sir,
Your most obedient servant,
C. J. Fox.

LETTER XVI.

FROM MR. WAKEFIELD TO MR. FOX.

SIR, Hackney, March 2, 1799.

Your kind attention at this time is peculiarly gratifying and consoling; but wholly congenial to that benevolence of disposition, which is the brightest jewel in all the accomplishments of humanity. My defence, though unsuccessful, was, in the opinion of my best friends, entirely consonant to my character. Some parts, I am aware, would be thought, by men of the world, severe and imprudent to excess; but *such* persecution for *such* things fills me, I own, with a degree of indignation and sorrow, to which no words appear to my mind capable of doing justice. Your approbation of my Lucretius is also particularly grateful to me.

I am, Sir,
with every sentiment of esteem,
Your obedient servant,

GILBERT WAKEFIELD.

LETTER XVII.

FROM MR. FOX TO MR. WAKEFIELD.

SIR, St. Anne's Hill, June 9, 1799.

NOTHING could exceed the concern I felt at the extreme severity (for such it appears to me) of the sentence pronounced against you.

I should be apprehensive, that the distance of Dorchester must add considerably to the difficulties of your situation; but should be very glad to learn from you that it is otherwise.

If any of your friends can think of any plan for you, by which some of the consequences of your confinement may be in any degree lessened, I should be very happy to be in any way assisting in it. From some words that dropped from you, when I saw you, I rather understood that you did not feel much inclination to apply to your usual studies in your present situation; otherwise it had occurred to me, that some publication, on a

less expensive plan than the Lucretius, and by subscription, might be eligible, for the purpose of diverting your mind, and for serving your family; but of this you are the best judge: and all I can say is, that I shall always be happy to shew the esteem and regard with which I am,

Sir,

Your most obedient servant,

C. J. Fox.

Rev Gilbert Wakefield,
King's Bench Prison.

LETTER XVIII

FROM THE SAME TO THE SAME.

SIR, St. Anne's Hill, June 10, 1799.

Within a few hours after I wrote to you yesterday, a Gentleman called, who informed me that a scheme had been formed for preventing some of the ill consequences of your imprisonment, and upon a much more eligible plan than that which I suggested. Of course, you will not think any more of what I said upon that subject;

only that, if you do employ yourself in writing during your confinement, my opinion is, that, in the present state of things, Literature is, in every point of view, a preferable occupation to Politics.

I have looked at my Roman Virgil, and find that it is printed from the Medicean MS. as I supposed. The verses regarding Helen, in the second book, are printed in a different character, and stated to be wanting in the MS.

Yours ever,

C. J. Fox.

LETTER XIX.

FROM MR. WAKEFIELD TO MR. FOX.

SIR, K. B. παρα Πλ[illegible]: June 10, 1799.

I am very highly gratified by your attention to me, as the attention of one whom I love and reverence.

In the present distraction of my mind, much enhanced by the consternation into which I am thrown by hearing this moment

of the unexpected sentence on Lord Thanet and Mr. Ferguson, I am scarcely capable of answering your kind inquiries in a proper manner; and therefore beg leave to inclose a Letter, received last night, which I am sure will give pleasure to a heart so interested, not in my welfare only, but in that of all his species: that Letter you will be so kind as to return. What I particularly meditate is a Greek and English Lexicon, at a subscription of a Guinea and a half: but of this plan I shall judge better when I see the place of my destination, whither I expect to be transported in a few days.

My sentence is not to be ranked among the *calamities* of human life: but it is a very serious *inconvenience* to us on many accounts, and on none more than a separation from a numerous band of the most affectionate and virtuous and disinterested friends, of both sexes, that it ever fell to the lot of any family to possess.

By the time in which my confinement will expire, I trust a prospect will be

opened of calling you from your beloved retirement, to a theatre of more extensive usefulness, alike adapted to the amplitude of your talents, and the benevolence of your disposition.

I am, Sir,
with every sentiment of esteem,
Your obedient servant,
GILBERT WAKEFIELD.

LETTER XX.

FROM MR. FOX TO MR WAKEFIELD.

SIR, St. Anne's Hill, June 12, 1799.

I RETURN you your friend's Letter, which gave me great satisfaction. The sentence upon Lord Thanet and Ferguson is, all things considered, most abominable; but the speech accompanying it is, if possible, worse.

I think a Lexicon in Greek and English

is a work much wanted; and, if you can have patience to execute such a work, I shall consider it a great benefit to the cause of Literature. I hope to hear from you that your situation at Dorchester is not worse, at least, than you expected; and, when I know you to be in a state of perfect ease of mind (which at this moment could not be expected), I will, with your leave, state to you a few observations, which I just hinted to you when I saw you, upon Porson's Note to his Orestes, regarding the final ν.

I am, with great regard,

Sir,

Yours ever,

C. J. Fox.

LETTER XXI.

FROM MR. WAKEFIELD TO MR. FOX.

SIR, King's Bench, June 14, 1799.

I SET out for Dorchester to-morrow or Monday; and shall be glad, at all times and in any place, to receive communications from you, upon points of criticism, or any other within my sphere. In the meantime, two of my Brothers have been down to reconnoitre the place; and from their report I collect, clearly, that this transportation thither was intended to be nothing less than a Cold-Bath Fields' business. It so happens, that in the small premises belonging to the governor, alias keeper, alias gaoler, a small lodging-room is to be obtained; whether with or without a fire-place I have hitherto forgotten to inquire; but with no accommodation for books, beyond a pocket-full or so: of course every plan of any laborious undertaking in literature is totally abandoned, and indeed

every object of study beyond an author such as Homer, who is pretty much concentered within himself. The intercourse even with my family, as far as I understand, will be partial and restrained: so that if a former occupant had been equal to that room in the house, nothing but a cell, in a most detestable building (to my Brothers' fancies), would have remained for myself. Upon the whole, considering the great inconveniences of an entire removal, and dissolution of our former residence, I am not sure, whether the Bastile, for the same term, might not have been as eligible. And, as I was never able to pursue any literary object without a comfortable disposition of external circumstances, I must postpone what projects I had entertained in that way to a more convenient season, if I should live to see it; and content myself with the amusements of my family, and occasional intercourse with my friends by letter or in person.

My defence, and other memorials of this

prosecution, which I thought it a part of my duty not to leave unrecorded, will be left for your acceptance, with a book which Lord Holland lent me.

I am, Sir, with the truest respect,
Your obliged servant,
GILBERT WAKEFIELD.



LETTER XXII.

FROM MR. FOX TO MR. WAKEFIELD.

SIR, St. Anne's Hill, June 27, 1799.

IN consequence of a Letter which Lord Holland shewed me, I have written to Lord Shaftesbury and to Lord Ilchester, who are both very humane men, and would, I should hope, be happy to do any thing that may make your situation less uneasy.

I am, Sir,
Yours ever,
C. J. FOX.

LETTER XXIII.

FROM MR. WAKEFIELD TO MR. FOX.

SIR, Dorchester Gaol, Sept. 6, 1799.

THE Courier of this day communicates to me the very unwelcome intelligence of an injury received by you, from the bursting of your gun. Assure yourself, Sir, that your oldest and warmest friends feel not a more lively interest in all your pains and pleasures than myself, nor will rejoice more at your recovery. And will you do me the justice to believe, that I would not have taken the trouble of submitting the following passage of CICERO to your consideration, but from an absolute conviction of your magnanimity and benevolence, and love of truth; and from an entire confidence in your candour, for assigning no motive to this intrusion, but an ardent desire of your approximation as nearly as possible to my own, perhaps visionary and mistaken,

notions of perfection?—"Ego autem, quam "diu respublica per eos gerebatur, quibus "se ipsa commiserat, omnes meas curas "cogitationesque in eam conferebam: cùm "autem dominatu unius omnia tenerentur, "neque esset usquam consilio aut auctori- "tati locus; socios denique tuendæ reipub- "licæ, summos viros, amisissem; nec me "angoribus dedidi, quibus essem confectus, "nisi iis restitissem, nec rursum INDIGNIS "HOMINE DOCTO VOLUPTATIBUS." *Off.* ii. 1.

Am I, Sir, indecently presumptuous and free, am I guilty of a too dictatorial officiousness, in pronouncing THOSE PLEASURES TO MISBECOME A MAN OF LETTERS, which consist in mangling, maiming, and depriving of that invaluable and irretrievable blessing, its existence, an inoffensive pensioner on the universal bounties of the common Feeder and Protector of all his offspring?

I remain, Sir,

Your obliged and respectful friend,

GILBERT WAKEFIELD.

LETTER XXIV.

FROM MR. FOX TO MR. WAKEFIELD.

SIR, No. 11, Sackville Street, Sept. 14, 1799.

I ASSURE you I take very kindly your Letter, and the quotation in it. I think the question of 'How far field sports are innocent amusements,' is nearly connected with another, upon which, from the title of one of your intended works, I suspect you entertain opinions rather singular; for if it is lawful to kill tame animals with whom one has a sort of acquaintance, such as *fowls, oxen,* &c. it is still less repugnant to one's feelings to kill wild animals; but then to make a *pastime* of it—I am aware there is something to be said upon this point. On the other hand, if example is allowed to be any thing, there is nothing in which all mankind, civilized or savage, have more agreed, than in making some sort of chace (for fishing is of the same

nature) part of their business or amusement. However, I admit it to be a very questionable subject: at all events, it is a very pleasant and healthful exercise. My wound goes on, I believe, very well; and no material injury is apprehended to the hand; but the cure will be tedious, and I shall be confined in this town for more weeks than I had hoped ever to spend days here. I am much obliged to you for your inquiries, and am,

Sir,

Your most obedient servant,

C. J. Fox.

LETTER XXV.

FROM MR. WAKEFIELD TO MR. FOX.

SIR, Dorchester Gaol, Sept. 20, 1799.

I AM unwilling to increase the inconveniences of your present situation, and have therefore not been solicitous of immediately acknowledging your favour; nor do I by any means wish you to incommode yourself, in the least degree, by noticing this, or any other similar intrusion from *me*.

With your leave, the question of *animal food* (from which the purest philosophers in all ages have abstained, the Pythagoreans, Bramins, Essenes, and others) is no more involved in that of *rural sports*, as commonly pursued, than the question of *racks and tortures* is connected with that of *capital punishments*. I would not now state, 'Is it lawful and expedient to kill animals 'at all?' but, 'Is it philosophical and 'humane to leave numbers of them to

'perish by pain and hunger, or to occasion 'the remainder of their lives to be perilous 'and miserable?' for such, I presume, are the inevitable consequences of *shooting* in particular. As for hunting; to see a set of men exulting in the distresses of an inoffensive animal, with such intemperate and wild triumph, is to me the most irrational and degrading spectacle in the world; and an admirable prolusion to those delectable operations which are transacting in Holland, and elsewhere!

In reading Ovid's Tristia (to my fancy, the first Poet of all Antiquity) with my Children, the other morning, (who, with my Wife, are forbidden by the Justices to come to me more than four days in a week, from ten o'clock to six,) I thought an error, not yet discovered, to occupy the introductory lines:—

Parve, nec invideo, sine me, Liber! ibis in urbem;
Hei mihi! quò domino non licet ire tuo.
Vade, sed incultus; qualem decet exsulis esse:
Infelix habitum temporis hujus habe.

By the bye, I have observed, (and mention,

I think, somewhere in Lucretius,) that the Poets never used *nec*, but always *neque*, before a word beginning with a vowel: in the first verse, therefore, it should be "*neque* invideo." But is there not something aukward and obscure, at first, in the construction of the third? The final *s* is written in MSS. after a manner likely to occasion errors; as *incultus*. I read, therefore,

Vade; sed *in cultu* qualem decet exsulis esse.

With my most cordial wishes for your speedy recovery, and less desolation in that *kingdom*, which one of my pupils, in construing that noble passage in the third Georgic,—(from which Gray has borrowed, in his Elegy,

"Nor cast one longing, lingering look behind,")——

Et stabula adspectans *regnis* excessit *avitis*,

called *the kingdom of birds*.

I remain, Sir,

Your most respectful and obliged friend,

GILBERT WAKEFIELD.

LETTER XXVI.

FROM MR. FOX TO MR. WAKEFIELD.

SIR, St. Anne's Hill, Oct. 22, 1799.

I BELIEVE I had best not continue the controversy about field sports; or at least, if I do, I must have recourse, I believe, to authority and precedent, rather than to argument; and content myself with rather excusing, than justifying them. Cicero says, I believe, somewhere, "Si quem "nihil delectaret nisi quod cum laude et "dignitate conjunctum foret, ... huic ho- "mini ego fortasse, et pauci, Deos propitios, "plerique iratos putarent." But this is said, I am afraid, in defence of a libertine, whose public principles, when brought to the test, proved to be as unsound, as his private life was irregular. By the way, I know no speech of Cicero's more full of beautiful passages than this is (pro M. Cælio), nor where he is more in his element. Argu-

mentative contention is what he by no means excels in; and he is never, I think, so happy, as when he has an opportunity of exhibiting a mixture of philosophy and pleasantry; and especially, when he can interpose anecdotes, and references to the authority of the eminent characters in the history of his country. No man appears, indeed, to have had such real respect for authority as he; and therefore, when he speaks on that subject, he is always natural, and in earnest; and not like those among *us,* who are so often declaiming about the wisdom of our ancestors, without knowing what they mean, or hardly ever citing any particulars of their conduct, or of their *dicta*.

I shewed your proposed alteration in the Tristia to a very good judge, who approved of it very much. I confess, myself, that I like the old reading best, and think it more in Ovid's manner; but this, perhaps, is mere fancy. I have always been a great [illegible]r of him, and thought myself the

greatest admirer he had, till you called him the first Poet of Antiquity, which is going even beyond me. The grand and spirited style of the Iliad; the true nature and simplicity of the Odyssey; the poetical language (far excelling that of all other Poets in the world) of the Georgics, and the pathetic strokes in the Æneid, give Homer and Virgil a rank, in my judgment, clearly above all competitors; but next after them I should be very apt to class Ovid, to the great scandal, I believe, of all who pique themselves upon what is called purity of taste. You have somewhere compared him to Euripides, I think; and I can fancy I see a resemblance in them. This resemblance it is, I suppose, which makes one prefer Euripides to Sophocles; a preference which, if one were writing a dissertation, it would be very difficult to justify. Euripides leads one to Porson, who, as I told you, is not content with putting the final ν as others have put it, before him, but adopts it even when the

following word begins with a mute and a liquid: and that he does this merely from a desire to differ as widely from you as possible, is evident. In his Note on verse 64 of the Orestes, are the words which I will copy and inclose. Now the cases of prepositions in compound words being made long, appear to me not very *rare;* though *rare* being an indefinite word, it is difficult to ascertain precisely the force he gives to it: but of the final vowel being long, of which he thinks there are *no* instances, there are a great many; at least I must suppose so, as I recollect several from mere memory But, what is most to the purpose, there is one in his Hecuba which I must suppose to be "indubiæ fidei;" as he was so far from stating it as a suspicious passage, that he did not point it out even as a remarkable one. It is verse 589:

Ω θυγατερ, ουκ οιδ' εις ὁ, τι βλεψω κακων·

but he had not then been angered by your observations, and had not, therefore, re-

solved to support the use of the ν in all possible places. You must allow it is difficult for us unlearned to have a proper confidence in great Critics, when they use us in this manner, and lay down general rules, which they never thought of before, only for the purpose of making the difference more wide between them and their opponents. In the Cyclops, v. 522, there is ουδενΑ βλαπτει βροτων· in the Electra of Euripides, v. 1058, there is αρΑ κλυουσα· and, I dare say, hundreds of more instances against him, as I found these by mere chance: and it has so happened, that I have not read any play of Euripides, or Sophocles, since I read his Note.

I cannot conceive upon what principle, or indeed from what motive, they have so restricted the intercourse between you and your family. My first impulse was, to write to Lord Ilchester to speak to Mr. Frampton; but, as you seem to suspect that former applications have done mischief, I shall do nothing. Your pupil's translation of '*avitis*'

shews that he has a good notion of the formation of words; and is a very good sign, if he is a young one. Did you, who are such a hater of war, ever read the lines at the beginning of the second book of Cowper's Task? There are few things in our language superior to them, in my judgment. He is a fine poet, and has, in a great degree, conquered my prejudices against blank verse.

I am, with great regard,

Sir,

Your most obedient servant,

C. J. Fox.

My hand is not yet so well as to give me the use of it, though the wound is nearly healed. The Surgeon suspects there is more bone to come away.—I have been here something more than a fortnight.

Professor PORSON'S *Note, inclosed in the preceding:*

" *Orestes*, v. 64.

" Παρθενον, εμη τε μητρι παρεδωκεΝ τρεφειν.

" Erunt fortasse nonnulli, qui minùs " necessario hoc factum (that is, the inser-" tion of the final ν) arbitraturi sint in " παρεδωκεν. Rationes igitur semel exponam, " nunquam posthac moniturus. Quanquam " enim sæpe syllabas naturâ breves positione " producunt Tragici, longè libentius corri-" piunt; adeo ut tria prope exempla correp-" tarum invenias, ubi unum modo exstet " productarum: sed hoc genus licentiæ, in " verbis scilicet non compositis, qualia τεκνον, " πατρος, ceteris longè frequentius est. " Rarius multo syllaba producitur in verbo " composito, si in ipsam juncturam cadit, ut " in πολυχρυσος, *Andr*. 2. Eâdem parsimoniâ " in augmentis producendis utuntur, ut " in επεκλωσεν, sup. 12. κεκλησθαι, Sophocl. " *Electr*. 366. Rarior adhuc licentia est,

"ubi præpositio verbo jungitur, ut in "αποτροποι, *Phœn.* 600. Sed ubi verbum in "brevem vocalem desinit, eamque duæ con-"sonantes excipiunt, quæ brevem manere "patiantur, vix credo exempla indubiæ fidei "inveniri posse, in quibus syllaba ista "producatur. Ineptus esset quicunque ad "MSS. in tali causâ provocaret, cum nulla "sit eorum auctoritas: id solum deprecor, "ne quis contra hanc regulam eorum "testimonio abutatur; MSS. enim neque "alter alteri consentiunt, neque idem MS. "sibi ipse per omnia constat. Quòd si ea, "quæ disputavi, vera sunt, planum est in "fine vocis addendam esse literam, quam "addidi."

LETTER XXVII.

FROM MR. WAKEFIELD TO MR. FOX.

SIR, Dorchester Gaol, Oct. 23, 1799.

I SAY, also, peace to our controversy! and I wish that every dispute of every kind could terminate as amicably, and after such gentle litigation: the differences of opinion in mankind would then issue in the general melioration of their tempers, and the augmentation of mutual esteem; instead of acrimony, revenge, and bloodshed. Only excuse my unsolicited freedom of remonstrance.

On the subject of Cicero, my opinions coincide with yours: but as the turn of my disposition has led me to inquiries connected with the history of human intellect, and human opinions; with the events of antient times, and the rise and progress of philosophy; to subjects also more immediately conversant with philology and

criticism, and the theory of language; my attention and affection have been fixed on his *philosophical* works, which I exceedingly reverence, rather than on his *orations* and *epistles*, the repositories of private incidents, and personal and local manners. But I mean only to state my propensities, not to extol them, or disparage the pursuits and predilections of other students.

What immediately led me to that conjecture in Ovid, was, an instantaneous repugnance of feeling to the connection of *qualem* with the participle *incultus:* and I am very much inclined to think, (for confidence on these points, of all others, is most inexcusable and absurd,) that no similar instance will readily be discovered; in which case I should be much more tenacious of the conjecture.

In appreciating the comparative excellencies of different poets, the first praise seems due to *invention:* and, as I should always omit Homer in these competitions, from our entire ignorance of the circum-

stances under which he wrote, and of the assistances which he might receive, no poet of antiquity seems capable of supporting the contest with Ovid. Virgil has produced more perfect poems; but then his obligations for materials are commensurate with the number of his verses; and would be seen still more clearly, if Euphorion and Nicander were now extant, fragments only of whose congenial performances are preserved. Quintilian, with that candour which distinguishes all his judgments, under a strong bias in favour of his countryman, after his admirable comparison of Demosthenes and Cicero, acknowledges that the palm must be yielded in this respect, "as Demosthenes made Cicero, in a great measure, what he was." By the bye, I may appear impertinent in recommending to your notice what you know so well: but that chapter of Quintilian, in which the comparison between the Greek and Roman authors is instituted, appears to me one of the most interesting compositions in all

antiquity. Horace, I think, has happily comprehended the constituent qualities of a poet in few words:

> Ingenium cui sit, cui mens divinior, atque os
> Magna sonaturum.——

"In the first endowment, fertility of invention and copiousness of thought, Ovid far exceeds his countryman: in the second, a noble enthusiastic fervour of imagination, whose effects are sublimity and pathos, some passages prove Ovid to have no superior among the sons of inspiration: see, in particular, many parts of his Epistle of Dido to Æneas, Phyllis to Demophoon, and some others; his entire Elegy on the Death of Tibullus, Metamorph. ii. ver. 333 to 344, vi. 426--433; and the whole story of Pythagoras, xv. 60, &c. which has no parallel in the monuments of human wit, to my fancy, among the Antients, (as at once moral and delightful,) except the conclusion of Lucretius's third Book, and the adventures of Ulysses with Alcinous in Homer. Very few readers have attended more to the

peculiarities of elegant construction and curious phraseology, whether of figure or combination, than myself; and I find such exquisite specimens and varieties in no poet, as I find in Ovid: while, as Quintillian says of Cicero, to the best of my recollection,—"hæc omnia fluunt illaborata; "et ea, quâ nihil dulcius esse potest oratio, "præ se fert tamen felicissimam facilita-"tem."—As to the third quality, magnificent language, Virgil has no rival there.

I am sorry that you gave yourself the trouble of transcribing Porson's Note, as his Orestes is one of the few books which I have got with me. At present, I am reading some voluminous Greek prose writers, with a view to my Lexicon incidentally; so that I do not expect to be able to read through the Tragedians for some months yet; when I shall pay particular regard to the points in controversy: in the meantime, I wish not to be positive, but open to conviction. But my persuasions about the final ν are grounded on this sort of reasoning.

It is not for us, at this time of day, to lay down the laws of Greek composition and versification, but to inquire into the actual practice of the Antients. Now it is most certain, that the old editions and old Scholiasts so generally omit the ν, where modern editors interpolate the letter, as to induce a most probable conviction, that it was *universally* omitted by the Antients; and that the few present exceptions are the officious insertions of transcribers and publishers, who would "be wise above what was written;" and modelled the MSS. by their own preconceptions of propriety. Whereas, from the current persuasion, among modern scholars, of the necessity of support to these short syllables by the application of consonants, it is perfectly inconceivable that they should have left the syllables in question unsustained, had they found the ν in their copies. Nay, it cannot be doubted, but modern editors, like Porson, would invariably supply the ν in all those places where early editors

were contented to omit it in obedience to their authorities; and, if the early editions were lost, all traces of the old practice, as it should seem to be, would presently be obliterated beyond recovery.

I have been furnished with many opportunities of observing PORSON, by a near inspection. He has been at my house several times, and once for an entire summer's day. Our intercourse would have been frequent, but for *three* reasons: 1. His extreme irregularity, and inattention to times and seasons, which did not at all comport with the methodical arrangements of my time and family. 2. His gross addiction to that lowest and least excusable of all sensualities, immoderate drinking: and, 3. The uninteresting insipidity of his society; as it is impossible to engage his mind on any topic of mutual inquiry, to procure his opinion on any author or on any passage of an author, or to elicit any conversation of any kind to compensate for the time and attendance of his company. And as for Homer, Virgil, and Horace, I never could

hear of the least critical effort on them in his life. He is, in general, devoid of all human affections; but such as he has, are of a misanthropic quality: nor do I think that any man exists, for whom his propensities rise to the lowest pitch of affection and esteem. He much resembles Proteus in Lycophron:

———ᾧ γελως απεχθεται,
Και δακρυ·—

though, I believe, he has satirical verses in his treasury, for Dr. Bellenden, as he calls him (PARR), and all his most intimate associates. But, in his knowledge of the Greek Tragedies, and Aristophanes; in his judgment of MSS. and in all that relates to the metrical proprieties of dramatic and lyric versification, with whatever is connected with this species of reading; none of his contemporaries must pretend to equal him. His grammatical knowledge also, and his acquaintance with the antient Lexicographers, and Etymologists, is most accurate and profound: and his intimacy with Shakspeare, B. Jonson, and other

dramatic writers, is probably unequalled. He is, in short, a most extraordinary person in every view, but unamiable; and has been debarred of a comprehensive intercourse with Greek and Roman authors, by his excesses, which have made those acquirements impossible to him, from the want of that *time*, which must necessarily be expended in laborious reading, and for which no genius can be made a substitute. No man has ever paid a more voluntary and respectful homage to his talents, at all times, both publickly and privately, in writings and conversation, than myself: and I will be content to forfeit the esteem and affection of all mankind, whenever the least particle of envy and malignity is found to mingle itself with my opinions. My first reverence is to Virtue; my second, only to talents and erudition: where both unite, that man is estimable indeed to me, and shall receive the full tribute of honour and affection.—But I am transgressing the rules of decorum, by this immoderate περιαυτολογια,

which yet, perhaps, is not unseasonable, and certainly wishes to stand exculpated in your sight.

I am so wholly immersed in my studies, that my spirits are entirely recovered; and, with the abatement of solitude (which no man ever abhorred more), I never was more comfortable in my life. To this, the most extraordinary solicitude and affection of my friends, some of the most virtuous characters that ever existed, have contributed not a little: and in this confinement, if I live, I shall combat some of that severe and unkindly reading, in authors of less gaiety and elegance, which, in a happier situation, would have been contended with more tardily and reluctantly, if contended with at all. It will give you pleasure to be informed, that a former pupil sent me, about a month ago, from Jamaica, 1000*l*.

I have occasionally looked in Cowper, though I possess him not. He appeared to me too frequently on the verge of the ludicrous and burlesque; but he deserves, I

dare say, the character which you give him. Whilst I am in health, and able to endure fatigue, I mortify myself by keeping to my main pursuits,

——*senex ut in otia tuta recedam*.

hoping, if I live to grow old, that I may then indulge myself more freely in gayer literature. But surely Milton might have reconciled you to blank verse, without the aid of Cowper!

I rejoiced to observe your Letter dated from your beloved retirement in the country; but your information respecting the amendment of your hand communicates but a mixed pleasure, if the gradual extrication of other fragments of the bones must be expected; a process, I fear, attended with inflammation and torture, in most cases of the kind. My best wishes attend you on all occasions; and excuse me, if, in the French style, which appears to me most manly and becoming, even for the sake of variety itself, I conclude myself,

Ever yours, with health and respect!

GILBERT WAKEFIELD.

[*The second of the two Letters from Mr.* WAKEFIELD, *which the following of Mr.* FOX *shews to have intervened, is wanting.*]

LETTER XXVIII.

FROM MR. FOX TO MR. WAKEFIELD.

SIR, St. Anne's Hill, Nov. 22, 1799.

I AM much obliged to you for your two Letters, and am very happy to find that your situation is become more easy than I had apprehended it was. If I should have an opportunity of getting you the use of any manuscripts from the persons you mention, or from any others, you may depend upon my attention to it. I know that Mr. Coke has some; and I will write to a friend who goes often to Holkham, to inquire whether there are any worth your notice. I have looked at the quotation in Diodorus, which certainly, as far as it goes, makes much for your system: but it is to be remarked, that some other parts of it stand in need of emendation; and there-

fore the whole may be supposed not to have been very accurately transcribed. Since I wrote last to you, I have read three plays of Euripides; and in them I find no less than five instances of that description, of which Porson, in his Note on the Orestes, supposes that there are none "*indubiæ fidei.*" They are as follow: Medea, vv. 246, 582. Troades, v. 628. Heraclidæ, vv. 391, 1044.; and I have little doubt but in the rest of his works, and probably in those of the other Tragedians, instances would occur in nearly a similar proportion. Porson's assertion, therefore, appears to me so outrageous a neglect of fact, that he ought to be told of it. In his Notes upon the Hecuba, v. 347 and 734, he makes two very singular remarks, in regard to metre, which (singular as they appear) are nevertheless, as far as my observation goes, just: but these were probably made upon much examination and consideration, and not for a particular purpose of supporting a new system, that had occurred to him, of

inserting the final ν where nobody else had done it: to which he could be tempted by no other motive than that of differing *toto cœlo* from you; and saying, "So far from "listening to your advice of omitting the ν "where others insert it, I will now insert "it where nobody ever thought of it." This is abominable.—In regard to the *general* question of the final ν, I agree with you that it must depend, in a great measure, upon MSS., and in so far as it does I am no judge of it, never having seen any of the Tragedians, nor indeed scarcely of any other Greek Poets: but, upon general reasoning, I own I am inclined to preserve it, because I think there is much in this argument. Vowels of a certain description are uniformly short in certain given positions, with the exception of such of those vowels only as occasionally admit the final ν (for the purpose of preventing the hiatus, &c.) Is it not, therefore, a fair conjecture, at least; and, if supported by any one old MS, almost a certain one, that,

in such exceptions, the final ν, which they, and they alone, were capable of admitting, was added. Porson uses this argument; but then he is not, as I have shewn you, supported by the fact. I have read over, possibly for the hundredth time, the portion of the Metamorphoses about Pythagoras; and I think you cannot praise it too highly. I always considered it as the finest part of the whole poem; and, possibly, the Death of Hercules as the next to it. I think your proposed alteration of "pendet" to "pandit," is a very fair one, if any is wanted; but upon looking into Ainsworth, the only Latin Dictionary I have, I find that Pliny uses "aranea" for the *down* that appears on some parts of willow: now I think he never could do this, unless "aranea" meant the web of a spider, as well as the animal itself. The Dictionary gives "*spider's web*" too, as one of the senses of "aranea;" but then it cites only the very passage we are upon, and is therefore nothing to the purpose.

I own, I do not see why, in the passage

of the Fasti, "defensæ" should be certainly erroneous. "Frondes defensæ arboribus," instead of "arbores defensæ frondibus," seems not unlike the poetical diction of the Latin Poets in general; but, if that is wrong, at any rate the other old reading of "excussæ" is unexceptionable; or, perhaps, a reading compounded of the two might do, such as "decussæ." The change of the punctuation in Juvenal is clearly, I think, an amendment. I have read again (what I had often read before) the chapter you refer to of Quintilian, and a most pleasing one it is; but I think he seems not to have an opinion quite high enough of our favourite Ovid; and, in his laboured comparison between Demosthenes and Cicero, he appears to me to have thought them more alike, in their manner and respective excellencies, than they seem to me. It is of them, I think, that he might most justly have said, "Magis pares quàm similes." I have no Apollonius Rhodius, and have never read of him more than what there is in our Eton

Poetæ Græci, and the Edinburgh *Collectanea*: but, from what I have read, he seems to be held far too low by Quintilian; nor can I think the "æqualis mediocritas" to be his character. The parts extracted in the above collections are as fine as poetry can be; and, I believe, are generally allowed to have been the model of what is certainly not the least-admired part of the Æneid: if he is in other parts *equal* to these, he ought not to be characterized by *mediocrity*. I wish to read the rest of his poem, partly for the sake of the poem itself, and partly to ascertain how much Virgil has taken from him: but I have not got it, and do not know what edition of it I ought to get: I should be much obliged to you if you would tell me. Shaw's is one of the latest; but, I think, I have heard it ill spoken of. If, at the same time, you would advise me in regard to the Greek Poets in general (of the second and third order, I mean), which are best worth reading, and in what editions, you would do me a great service.

Of Aratus, Nicander, Dionysius, Oppian, Nonnius, Lycophron, I have never read a word, except what has occurred in notes on other authors; nor do I know what poems those are which Barnes often alludes to, calling them *Troïca.* Against Lycophron, I own, I am somewhat prepossessed, from hearing from all quarters of the difficulty of understanding him. The Argonautics, that go under the name of Orpheus, I have read, and think that there are some very beautiful passages in them, particularly the description of Chiron, &c. I have read, too, Theognis; and observed four verses in him that are full as applicable to other countries, as ever they could be to any city in Greece:

Λαξ επιϐα δημω κενεοφρονι· τυπτε δε κεντρω
Οξεϊ, και ζευγλην δυσλοφον αμφιτιθει.
Ου γαρ εθ' ευρησεις λαον φιλοδεσποτον ὡδε
Ανθρωπων, ὁποσȣς ηελιος καθορα.

I wish to read some more, if not all, of the Greek Poets, before I begin with those Latin ones that you recommend; especially as I take for granted that Valerius Flaccus

(one of them) is in some degree an imitator of Apollonius Rhodius. Of him, or Silius Italicus, I never read any; and of Statius but little. Indeed, as, during far the greater part of my life, the reading of the Classics has been only an amusement, and not a study, I know but little of them, beyond the works of those who are generally placed in the first rank; to which I have always more or less attended, and with which I have always been as well acquainted as most idle men, if not better. My practice has generally been "multum potius quàm multos legere." Of late years, it is true that I have read with more critical attention, and made it more of a study; but my attention has been chiefly directed to the Greek language, and its writers; so that in the Latin I have a great deal still to read: and I find that it is a pleasure which grows upon me every day. Milton, you say, might have reconciled me to blank verse. I certainly, in common with all the world, admire the grand and stupendous passages

of the Paradise Lost; but yet, with all his study of harmony, he had not reconciled me to blank verse. There is a want of flow, of ease, of what the painters call a free pencil, even in *his* blank verse, which is a defect in poetry that offends me more perhaps than it ought: and I confess, perhaps to my shame, that I read the Fairy Queen with more delight than the Paradise Lost: this may be owing, in some degree, perhaps, to my great partiality to the Italian Poets.

I have no doubt but your Dictionary will be a very interesting work, to those who love the Greek language; but 20,000 new words seem impossible; unless you mean, by new words, new significations of old words. I have some notions upon the subject of a Greek Dictionary that are perhaps impracticable, but, if they could be executed, would, I think, be incredibly useful: but this Letter is too unconscionably long to make me think of lengthening it by detailing them.

My hand mends slowly, but regularly;

and I do not now think there will be any exfoliation of the bone, though that is not certain. I am very glad to hear your Jamaica pupil, whoever he be, has done both you and himself so much honour. I say nothing of the late surprising events: the ends may be good, but the means seem very odious. I shall think the degree of liberty they allow to the press the great criterion of their intentions.

Yours ever,

C. J. Fox.



LETTER XXIX.

FROM MR. WAKEFIELD TO MR. FOX.

SIR, Dorchester Gaol, Nov. 27, 1799.

Our want of accord on the final and critical emendations proves to me the necessity of a work (of which all the materials are ready on my papers) on the rationale of criticism, as founded on philo-

sophical principles, corroborated and ascertained by the real practice of transcribers and indubitable specimens from authors; otherwise, no assent can be expected in the majority of cases. My argument for the perpetual omission of the ν stands thus: It is universally allowed, that the early editors adhered more closely to their MSS. In their editions, the final ν is *commonly* omitted. In such works as Scholia, of which few copies were circulated, that ν is *always* omitted. Good reasons may be assigned for the occasional insertion, but none possibly for the omission. Owners of MSS. have perpetually corrected them, as we see at this day, according to their own fancy; and if Porson, for example, had them all, in time he would put in the ν throughout; and these MSS. might go down as vouchers for the practice of antiquity. Very little learning would suffice, to induce men to insert ν, from an opinion of vicious quantity; so that a very old MS. now might abound in that insertion, though

its prototype were without it; and so on. But the acknowledged omission in innumerable instances even now, and that obvious reason for its insertion in the rest, when no possible solution can be given for the regular omission, induce, to my apprehension, a probability of the highest kind, that the Antients never used it at all.—More might be said; but this is the substance of the argument.

In Ovid, Fast. iii. 537, the case stands thus: I find in books of authority two very different readings, *detonsæ* and *excussæ*. Whether either of these words will do, is by no means the first consideration. I want some probable account of this strange variation, which, like all other facts, must have a cause; and before the passage can be mended, a probable cause must be alleged. There is no resemblance in the letters; therefore we cannot satisfactorily suppose one word to have been mistaken for the other, by the transcriber's eye. I think, therefore, that Ovid gave *exustæ*.

Why? 1. Because it resembles *excussæ* in its characters, and most likely in its pronunciation; so as to be confounded, either through eye-sight, or through dictation. 2. Because either *detonsæ* or *excussæ* may be reasonably supposed a marginal gloss, or interlineary interpretation of the word proposed; of which MSS. are full. 3. *Exustæ*, being an elegant word, and a word which implies some reading and taste to relish and understand it, would be readily superseded in the hands of a sciolist (whether transcriber, or owner of a MS.), by one more suited to his fancy; such as the other readings. These are my reasons; none of which can be assigned for the other two words. If now it should be said, that either of the other will do, I say, No: 1. Because no man, I dare say, can bring me any passage, from all antiquity, in which frost or cold is said "*tondere* folia," or any thing like it. 2. Because *excussæ* and its kindred are words of *violence*, and, I will venture to affirm, are never applied to the

gentle and gradual operation of a *frost*. (Excuse me, if I appear positive: it is only in the expression, which one acquires from the study of mathematics; where, after constructing the figure, it is usual to add, "*I say*, the triangle so and so is the triangle required.") And with respect to phrases, I have noted their peculiarities so copiously in my own Dictionary, that I speak with some confidence, on that account merely, with respect to them.

Apollonius Rhodius was a great grammarian, as well as a poet; and therefore you should by all means have an edition with the Scholia. Shaw's, though of no value as a critical work, is prettily printed, has the Scholia, and a most excellent Index; and is therefore a very commodious book for use. You should get the last 8vo edition. Brunck, however, it is impossible to do without, on account of his accuracy, and his MSS. It is a 12mo, not very easily got: there was one at Lackington's the beginning of this year. Stiffness, and want

of perspicuity and simplicity, appear to me the failings of Apollonius Rhodius.

Aratus, as a versifier, is much in the same style; and in language harsh and difficult, partly from his subject. His *Phænomena* will hardly be relished, but by the lovers of astronomy; but his other work, on the Signs of the Weather, must be read, as it has been translated nearly by Virgil, in Geo. i. The small Oxford edition is the best I know: it is become scarce and dear. I rather think they are republishing this poet in Germany. You would know by inquiring at Elmsley's. This poet has been little read, and seldom published.

Nicander you will never have patience to read, I think; otherwise, he was also a great linguist, but as obscure at least as Lycophron; though his (Nicander's) obscurity is in the quaint and learned phrase, not in the meaning. His first poem, of about six hundred verses, treats of vegetable, mineral, and animal poisons, and their remedies: his second, of about a thousand verses, of

noxious animals, their bites and stings, and remedies. They are good for me, as a Lexicon compiler, and a scholar by profession; but I cannot recommend them to you.

Dionysius Periegetes is, to my mind, the sweetest and simplest writer, both for verse and diction, of all the Greeks, far and wide, after Homer. The best and pleasantest edition, to my knowledge, is Stephens's, or the Oxford, which may easily be procured. They are very numerous. There are also some London editions; but beware of Wells's mutilated and interpolated edition, for the use of Westminster School.

Oppian is very puerile, and writes in a false taste; but his descriptions are entertaining and exact. He alone, of all the Antients, delineates the camelopard very accurately, and from nature. He will recompense the trouble of perusal. The best edition is Schneider's. Ballu, a Frenchman, began a very pretty edition; but the *Halieutics*, by him, have not yet appeared. Rittershusius' also is not amiss.

Nonnus was a Christian poet of much later date than the former; of a most puerile and romantic cast: wrote a poem as long as all Homer: difficult to be procured, and not likely to approve himself to you. He versified also, pleasantly enough, John's Gospel.

Lycophron by all means read, in Potter's later edition. A spirit of melancholy breathes through his poem, which makes him, with his multitude of events, as delightful to me as any of the Antients. I have read him very often, and always with additional gratification. His poem is delivered in the form of a *prophecy;* and therefore affects an ænigmatical obscurity, by enveloping the sentiment in imagery, mythological allusions, and a most learned and elaborate phraseology. Most obscure in himself, he is rendered perfectly plain and easy by his scholiast, Tzetzes, who was a Jew. No man equal to him in the purity of his iambics; so that anapæst, tribrachys, and dactyl, are extremely rare in him. His narrative

of the adventures of the Grecian chiefs, particularly Ulysses, after the fall of Troy, is infinitely interesting; and his prospect of Xerxes' expedition into Greece, the devastation of his army, &c. is nobly executed. You cannot fail, I think, after the first difficulties are surmounted, to like him much.

No resemblance, but in the name of the poem, between Apollonius Rhodius and Valerius Flaccus. He and Statius have ideas and expressions frequently beyond Virgil. Varro wrote an Argonautic Expedition, which Valerius Flaccus may possibly have imitated.

The Classics have been your *amusement*, not your *study*. Alas! the reverse has been the case very much with me. I have always reckoned upon amusing myself, if I lived to grow old; and have been therefore resolutely *labouring*, under almost every species of disadvantage, in my youth. On this account I never purchased Cowper: I have met with him occasionally. He appears to

me a man of fine genius; but his *Task* borders too much on the burlesque for a fine poem. My revisal of Pope's Homer led me to read his translation of the Greek; and of all the miserable versification in blank verse, that is the most miserable I have yet seen. I have scarcely any books here; but I remember the beginning of Odyssey X. to be the most calamitous specimen of want of ear that ever came under my notice. It would be rash in me to give an opinion of his versification elsewhere; but between *his* versification in Homer, and that of Milton's *Paradise Lost*, there is, to my sense, as great a difference as can exist between two things that admit comparison at all. The *Faery Queen* stanza was always tiresome to me.

You would cease to wonder at my twenty thousand words, if you saw my Lexicons; words good and true. You may cease also, when I mention that there are at least as many words of Nicander as that poet has verses, in no common Lexicon; two or three

hundred in Oppian, as many thousand in Nonnus; and when I mention further, that in a day, one day with another, when I am occupied in this work, I at least add twenty from my reading, for months together; some, original words; the generality, compounds. What think you of five hundred solid and nervous words on the margin of my Johnson, not found in him, from *Milton* only; and perhaps two hundred from the same source, which Johnson gives, but without authority?

I am very glad to hear so good an account of your hand.

I am, Sir,

Your obliged friend,

GILBERT WAKEFIELD.

LETTER XXX.

FROM THE SAME TO THE SAME.

SIR, Dorchester Gaol, March, 1800.

I trouble you with the Proposals for my Lexicon; an enterprise of such magnitude, and such ungrateful labour, as almost overpowers my mind in the prospect of it. Had some of our most opulent countrymen your taste and zeal for antient literature, a small portion of their superfluous wealth would be readily applied to a much more complete performance, which would not reach above two good volumes in folio; and the civilization of our present barbarous manners would be essentially promoted, I think, by the promotion of useful letters. In general, I have been always desirous of considering sound learning and virtuous manners as convertible terms,—generally, I say, not universally; and would willingly subscribe to the truth

of one of the noblest passages in antient poetry:

——— ουτε γαρ ὑπνος,
Ουτ' εαρ εξαπινας γλυκερωτερον, ουτε μελισσαις
Ανθεα, ὁσσον εμιν Μωσαι φιλαι· οὑς γαρ ὁρευντι
Γαθευσαι, τως ου τι ποτῳ δαλησατο Κιρκα.

I am, Sir,

Your obliged servant,

GILBERT WAKEFIELD.

LETTER XXXI.

FROM MR FOX TO MR WAKEFIELD.

SIR, St. Anne's Hill, March 12, 1800.

I RECEIVED yesterday your Letter, with the Proposals for the Lexicon. I see innumerable advantages in an English interpretation; to which the only objection is, that it will confine the sale to this country: and, how far it may be possible to get two thousand subscriptions for a work useful only to English readers of Greek, I am afraid

is doubtful. If Schools and Colleges are excepted, the number of those who ever even look at a Greek book in this country is very small: and you know enough of Schools, no doubt, to suspect that partiality to old methods is very likely to make them adhere to Latin interpretations, notwithstanding the clear advantage of using for interpretation the language we best understand. My endeavours to promote the work shall not be wanting, and you will of course set me down as a subscriber. My idea with regard to a Greek Dictionary, which I hinted at in a former Letter, was suggested by a plan of a French Dictionary, mentioned by Condorcet in his Life of Voltaire. It is this: That a chronological catalogue should be made of all the authors who are cited in the work; and that the sense of every word should be given, first, from the oldest author who has used it; and then should follow, in regular chronological order, the senses in which it was afterwards used by more modern authors. Where the sense has not

altered, it should be observed in this manner: " Θεος, *a God. Homer: and is used in the same manner by the other authors.*" Thus we should have a history of every word, which would certainly be very useful; but perhaps it would require a greater degree of labour than any one man could perform. Condorcet says, that Voltaire had offered to do one letter of a Dictionary upon a principle something like this: but, even if he would have kept his word, one letter of a *French* Dictionary, upon this plan, would not be a hundredth part of a Greek one; for, besides the much greater copiousness of the Greek, the great distance of time between the early and the late writers must make a Dictionary upon this principle more bulky when applied to that language, (but, for the same reason, more desirable,) than it would be in any other.

Soon after I wrote to you last, I read Apollonius (in Shaw's edition, for I have not been able to get Brunck's); and upon the whole had great satisfaction from him.

His language is sometimes hard, and very often, I think, prosaïcal; and there is too much narration: but there are passages quite delightful to me, and I think his reputation has been below his merit. Both Ovid and Virgil have taken much from him; but the latter less, as appears to me, than has been commonly said. Dido is, in very few instances, a copy of Medea; whereas I had been led to suppose that she was almost wholly so: and of Hypsipyle, whose situation is most like Dido's, Apollonius has made little or nothing. I have lately read Lycophron, and am much obliged to you for recommending it to me to do so: besides there being some very charming poetry in him, the variety of stories is very entertaining. Without Tzetzes I should not have understood, however, a tenth part of him; nor would they, perhaps, who treat this poor Scholiast with so much contempt, have understood much more. There remain, after all, some few difficulties, which if you can clear up to

me, I shall be much obliged to you; and upon which neither Canterus, Meursius, nor Potter, give me any help. The most important of these is, that which belongs to the part where he speaks of the Romans in a manner that could not be possible for one who lived in the time of Ptolemy Philadelphus, that is, even before the first Punic war. Tzetzes speaks, it is true, of such an observation having been made; but remarks only upon the absurd way in which it has been expressed, without answering the observation itself: and the other commentators above mentioned are silent upon it. I see no remedy but leaving out verse 1226, and all the following verses down to v. 1281; and in favour of doing this, it is to be observed, that 1281 and 1282 have a much more correct sense if they follow verse 1225, than placed as they now are: for *οἱ την εμην μελλοντες αιστωσαι πατραν* cannot well apply to Æneas or the Romans; and *τοσαυτα*, in v. 1286, naturally applies to the *last-mentioned* calamities. If these verses

are to stand, I think it must be admitted, that the poem is not so antient as is supposed, and that, if the author's name was Lycophron, it was not at least that Lycophron who lived in Philadelphus's time. If this hypothesis is admitted, then Tzetzes' interpretation of v. 1446 and the following verses is not so absurd as the other commentators state it to be; and they may very well relate to the first of the Ptolemies who was in alliance with Rome (I forget his surname); or still better to Philip of Macedon, if the poem was written soon after his peace with Rome, and prior to the Roman war with his son Perseus. As the matter now stands, the allusion is given up as desperate. My next difficulty is in line 808, in regard to the word ποσις, which, how it can describe Telemachus (as is supposed) I cannot conceive. The husband of whom? of nobody mentioned before: certainly not of the δαμαρτος, whom he killed: and if of her who is mentioned after, she is called *sister*, and therefore the word husband does

not naturally refer to her; for though she is supposed to be both sister and wife, yet when you say " the husband was killed by his sister," it cannot mean a sister that was wife too. Scaliger, in his translation, has it "frater:" and κασις would do for the verse; but even then the construction is very hard, as the κασις must refer to the αδελφη mentioned two lines after. As it now stands, I think it must allude to some lost story, in which Telemachus, or some son of Ulysses, is supposed to have killed his own wife, and to have been killed in revenge by that wife's sister, or his own. The difficulty does not seem to be felt, at least it is not explained by the commentators. I could not at first understand ver. 407; but I thought I remembered something of yours upon the subject; and, upon looking into your notes upon Ion, I found it perfectly explained; only I cannot find in my Lexicons (I have only Stephens's Thesaurus and Morell's Hederic) that πονη ever signifies the string of a bow. In v. 1159, I find the

word εφθιτωμενης, from some such word as φθιτοω, which I cannot find any where. Of this the commentators take no notice. In v. 869, I think πηδημα is an incomprehensible expression, if the sense is as is supposed (for I do not take it to have the double meaning of the Latin word "saltus"); and I understood it, before I looked at the comment, to be a description of Venus herself, according to one of the mythological accounts of her birth; nor am I quite sure I was wrong. The omission of the particle γε after κογχειας, in the same line in one MS, would rather favour my interpretation. If you have a Lycophron with you, and much leisure, I shall be obliged to you for your opinion upon some of the above passages; for, excepting these, I do not think there are any about which I have much difficulty; though I may have forgot some, as I did not note down any whilst I was reading him: and there are, besides, many words new to me; but where the commentators have taken notice of them,

and so explained them that I can acquiesce in their explanation, I do not trouble you with them. The passage you quote from Theocritus is most beautiful: I suppose Horace took his idea of his

Quem tu, Melpomene, semel —

from it; for, besides the general resemblance of the sentiment, the shape in which it is put seems exactly the same;

Ους γαρ ὁρητε, τως ουκ, &c.
Quem tu videris, illum non, &c

I have written it ὁρητε, because I understand, from my edition, that is the oldest reading; and if so, I think the change of Person rather an elegance than a defect: not that I should think it worth while to alter it, which ever way it stood. At any rate, I like ὁρευντι γαθευσαι, as you write it, better than ὁρωσαι γαθεωσι, which is in the text of my edition.

You have heard from the newspapers, of course, of my going to the House of Commons last month. I did it more in consequence of the opinion of others, than from

my own; and when I came back, and read the lines 1451, 2, 3 of Lycophron,

Τι μακρα τλημων εις ανηκοους πετρας,
Εις κυμα κωφον, εις ναπας δυσπλητιδας
Βαζω, κενον ψαλλουσα μαστακος κροτον;

I thought them very apposite to what I had been about. In the last of the three, particularly, there is something of comic, that diverted me, at my own expense, very much. I mean

Βαζω, κενον ψαλλουσα μαστακος κροτον.

I believe I ought to make you some apology for this long and tedious Letter; but trusting to your goodness, I shall make none, except that it is, in part, the consequence of that zeal for literature, which you suppose (and I hope, in general, truly—universally certainly *not*) leads to better things.

Yours ever truly,

C. J. Fox.

LETTER XXXII.

FROM MR. WAKEFIELD TO MR. FOX.

SIR, Dorchester Gaol, March 13, 1800.

I AM very glad that you like Lycophron. The only exception to him is, that quaintness of phraseology which borders on burlesque: but I suppose the necessity of correspondence with the oracular style of antiquity produced this singularity, for the old oracles are altogether in this strain. Some time ago I sent for my Oxford Lycophron,—but great inconvenience attends the search of my books,—and an old copy of another edition came in its stead, which I cannot use commodiously. I expect the right book by the first convenient opportunity of conveyance; when I mean to read him again very attentively, and will keep in view your difficulties and doubts. In truth, I am very careful about this migration of my library; because all my notes

are on the margins, and I am not fond of hazarding inconsiderately the labours of my life. These little things are great to little men. The disadvantages and vexations which this confinement has occasioned, in this way, cannot easily be enumerated, and are very irksome to my feelings.

That disadvantage of an English interpretation to the Lexicon was foreseen, and, on a general estimate, disregarded. I am not very solicitous for its success; and shall abandon the project without reluctance, if the country does not furnish encouragement sufficient for it. No word, properly speaking, can have more than two senses: its primary *picture* sense, derived from external objects and operations; and its secondary and consequential: a rule which would make short work, but very proper work, with most Dictionaries; and reduce Johnson's strange ramifications of meaning into twenty or thirty shoots, to one *original* sense, and two or three shades of *inferential*.

What I once said of my number of additional words, surprised you. I am reading Manetho, an old astrologer, whom I have read before, but not with this particular view; and one who probably never came in your way. He is a good writer of his class, and a most correct versifier; but deals very largely in new words. Before your letter came, for the gratification of my own curiosity, I had noted all the words, not inserted in Hederic, which I had met with since the morning. They amount to *seventy-two*; and not so much as *two thirds* of my day's work is yet finished.

I should have thought that you might have got a Brunck's Apollonius Rhodius at Lackington's. They had several before my departure from the world. I shall begin him in a few days; and may perhaps trouble you with a few conjectures, though my principal copy is not here.

To my mind, nothing was ever more soothing in the melancholy strain, than many passages in Lycophron; but, as you

justly observe, he would be absolutely unintelligible, in most parts, without his Scholiast, to whom more obligations are due, on that account, than to the Scholiast of any other author whatever.

I never met with that reading, ὁρητε, in the second person, in that passage of Theocritus. I should except to it, because not in his way, as his poetry does not furnish a beauty of that kind. Milton very finely adopted it from Virgil, in his Evening Hymn:

——— Thou also mad'st the night,
Maker omnipotent! &c.

In the next page but one of my Silv. Critica, (vol. i. p. 22.) where I have illustrated the verses of Theocritus by some very beautiful parallels, p. 23, are some excellent exemplifications of that sudden conversion to *address* from *narrative:* to which add Acts of the Apostles, xiii. 22. xiv. 22; for no writer has been more successful in this respect than Luke: see, too, Polybius, i. 344. Ernesti's edition.

Your absentation from the House is a measure which always had my most entire concurrence; nor do I less approve your late appearance there: not that I expected any immediate benefit from your exertions; but because I think your friends and the public expected that effort from you. My opinion was, I own, (but I venture a dissent from you on any subject, and most of all on this, with extreme diffidence,) that you should have absented yourself sooner; and for this plain reason: Such discussion and debate, in opposition to Ministers, contributed to encourage a delusion through the country, that measures were to be carried in that House by argument and the force of truth, when they certainly were not to be carried by such influence.

There is another author, Tryphiodorus, who is short, and therefore not very troublesome in that respect, whom you might wish to read: Merrick published an edition of him, with an excellent English translation: an edition has been given also by a

pupil of mine, Mr. Northmore: either are easily procurable, and you would not regret the bestowal of two or three hours upon him.

No apology is necessary for any application to me on these subjects. I shall be abundantly recompensed, if my superior assiduity may enable me to contribute any particle of gratification to your studies.

I remain, Sir,

Your obliged friend,

GILBERT WAKEFIELD.

LETTER XXXIII.

FROM MR. FOX TO MR. WAKEFIELD

SIR, St. Anne's Hill, March 14, 1800.

I HAVE received your Letter; and will certainly write to Lord Ilchester, and apply, through some channel that may be proper, to the persons you mention; or take such other measures as, upon consultation with my Nephew, may be thought advisable. In regard to the question of submitting to extreme extortion, if it should come to that, I confess myself not to be of the stout side, unless it should be necessary upon a prudential principle, which I hope it is not. A person in your situation is not called upon for any voluntary sacrifices to public considerations, for which he already suffers quite sufficiently.

Yours ever,

C. J. Fox.

LETTER XXXIV.

FROM THE SAME TO THE SAME.

SIR, St. Anne's Hill, March 19, 1800.

My Nephew writes me word that he is to see Mr. Moreton Pitt, who, I believe, has more influence, in regard to the prison, than any of the other Magistrates. When I mentioned *prudential* reasons, it was not with a view to discourage them, but on the contrary. But with regard to the effects of an ill example, I am clearly of opinion that your situation dispenses with your making any sacrifice to such a consideration, when put in competition with your ease and convenience.

I am much obliged to you for what you mention in regard to the Anthologia, which I shall attend to, as well as to your recommendation of Hales of Eton. I thought the principal beauties of the Anthologia would be in Brunck's Ana-

lecta; a book which I have not yet got, though it is a year since I commissioned my Bookseller to get it for me. I believe the next Greek author I shall read will be Diogenes Laertius.

Yours ever,

C. J. Fox.

P. S. Till I know the result of Lord Holland's application to Mr. Pitt, I think it best to delay any other application; but, you may depend upon it, whatever my Nephew and I can do, shall be done.

LETTER XXXV.

FROM MR. WAKEFIELD TO MR. FOX.

SIR, Dorchester Gaol, March 20, 1800.

It is well that you have not obtained Brunck's Analecta; because Jacobs' is a republication of the very book, with infinite improvement; and may be had, except the last volume, at any time I should think, of Elmsley, if not of your own Bookseller.

Another book I forgot to mention, as worthy of your notice,—the edition of *Orpheus de Lapidibus*, by that very modest and most ingenious person, the late Mr. Tyrwhitt: but take care that his Dissertation on Babrius, with the exquisite fragments of that neat and simple writer, be annexed. Scarcely any loss is more to be regretted than that of Babrius, as you will judge from his remains; which, I think it

probable that you may not have seen collected.

When you are at a loss, Quintus Calaber would amuse you, from the light which his long poem throws on the Trojan war: and his connection, in these respects, with the nobler Poets confers an indirect and incidental value on his rambling, and, in general, puerile performance.

It is singular, and probably you might observe it, that all the words quoted from Lycophron, in Morell's Hederic, are stated as being found in Lycurgus: "*Lycurg.*" at least in my 4to edition of 1790. And, on this subject of mistakes, Is it not also extraordinary, that the verses from Shakspeare, which are put at the head of the daily occurrences in the Morning Chronicle, have been wrongly arranged to this day, through the last ten years, the term of my acquaintance with the paper?

I am sorry that you do not readily procure Brunck's Apollonius Rhodius. The text is wonderfully improved from his

MSS.; and my doctrine of the final ν evinced beyond all dispute. Brunck, however, did not see, or would not acknowledge, the omission to that extent in which I maintain it; and, you will perceive, involves himself accordingly in numerous embarrassments and self-contradictions, both in that edition, and his edition of the Tragedians.

I remain, Sir,

Your obliged friend,

GILBERT WAKEFIELD.

LETTER XXXVI.

FROM THE SAME TO THE SAME.

SIR Dorchester Gaol, April 8, 1800.

As Mr. M. Pitt is going to town to-morrow, and the Duke of Grafton and Lord Holland have promised to see him, an application at the same time to Mr. Frampton could not fail of a beneficial effect; who, during Mr. Pitt's absence in Ireland, has interested himself much in the affairs of this place.

It should be understood, that I want no interference with A. in the management of his own family, or the disposal of his house; but merely a provision, by the Magistrates, of a place where I shall not perish with the inclemency of winter, if A. will not continue me under his roof at the expiration of this year. Mr. F. will receive another application, through his tutor, Dr. Huntingford, warden of Winchester Col-

lege, with whom I have occasionally communicated by Letter in former days.

You will find in the Life of Diogenes, in Diogenes Laertius, whom you spoke of as your next author to be perused, many diverting applications of Homer's verses; and if you have Casaubon's Athenæus, the Index prefixed will point out a most ludicrous appropriation of the initial verses of Sophocles' Electra, by a celebrated courtesan. If you should not discover the place, or not have an Athenæus at hand, I will relate the circumstance for your entertainment, when less incommoded by the pressure of those inconveniences which attend these sudden movements at this place; for I learn, but this moment, Mr. Pitt's intention to visit London before the Sessions.

I am, Sir,

Your obliged friend,

GILBERT WAKEFIELD.

LETTER XXXVII.

FROM MR. FOX TO MR. WAKEFIELD.

SIR, St. Anne's Hill, April 13, 1800.

I HAVE not yet begun Diogenes Laertius, having been a good deal occupied of late. The little Greek I have been reading lately has been in Pindar, where I confess I find some difficulties; nor have I yet met with any passages equal in beauty to those odes of his which are in the Eton Extracts.

I have Casaubon's Athenæus, but (owing perhaps to my not knowing how to search them) I cannot find, in any of the Indexes, the appropriation of the beginning of Sophocles' Electra which you mention. In the list of plays quoted under the head of Sophocles' Electra, it does not appear; nor can I find it from the Index at the end, under the heads of Phryne, Thaïs, or Laïs.

I am, Dear Sir,

Yours ever,

C. J. Fox.

LETTER XXXVIII.

FROM THE SAME TO THE SAME.

SIR, St. Anne's Hill, April 20, 1800.

I have received a Letter from Lord Ilchester, who promises to speak to Mr. Frampton. My Nephew has spoken to Mr. M. Pitt, who seems to be very willing to do what is right, and says he will speak with you concerning the business. A room at the Gaoler's, if it can be had on moderate terms, I should think most eligible; and of your obtaining that, either by Mr. M. Pitt's interference, or otherwise, I should hope there is little doubt.

Pindar's Pythics appear to me much superior, in general, to his Olympics: I do not know whether this is a general opinion: however, the second Olympic is still my favourite.

I am, Sir,

Yours ever most truly,

C. J. Fox.

LETTER XXXIX.

FROM MR. WAKEFIELD TO MR. FOX.

SIR, Dorchester Gaol, May 27, 1800.

I RECEIVED my Lycophron a little time since; and have been reading him again. I have neither the proper books here, nor chronological memory, sufficient to judge of your objection to the authenticity of the passage from v. 1226 to 1281, from the progress of the Roman conquests at that time: but a general objection arises to the latter parts of the poem, from the aukward poetical salvo in ver. 1373, which one aware of the prophetic character was not likely to have introduced. But is it incredible, that an attentive observer of the times, and the rising greatness of the Romans, might venture to predict the extent of their future sway in the general terms of ver. 1229, especially with Homer's ex-

ample before him, Il. Υ. 307, 308? Just as that remarkable prophecy also of Seneca,

————venient annis
Secula seris, &c

might readily force itself on the mind of a philosopher at all acquainted with the figure of the globe, and the disproportion of the terrestrial parts, then known, to the seas and ocean. The absence of my books disables me from specifying the tragedy and verse: but you will probably recollect the passage. The greatest singularity of this nature, which recurs to my memory, is an anticipated description of the Jesuits before the establishment of that fraternity; which is quoted, somewhere about the time of their origin, in the Notes to Mosheim's Ecclesiastical History—Maclean's translation.

At ver. 807...812, I perceive no difficulty, but one, occasioned by the word ποσις, rendered obscure by its nearness to δαμαρτος, to which it does not refer. I render thus, and understand: "When he (Ulysses) shall

" breathe out his life, lamenting the cala-
" mities of his son and wife; which wife
" (Circe), *a* husband, or married man,
" (namely, of Cassiphone the daughter,)
" having slain, will himself go in the next
" place to the grave, *killed off* by his sister
" (his relation), who was the relation of
" Glaucon, &c."

The difficulty is increased by the expression of ver. 809, which naturally carries you to Ulysses, and his descent into the infernal regions; but may easily mean, that she (the wife) went the πρωτην ὁδον, for πρωτη *first;* and Telemachus went the δευτεραν, or *after her:* which are common variations of phrase.

As to ver. 407. Παγην, or παγιν var. lect. means a *snare;* and so, by inference, a *string*, or *nervum*; as *bird-snares* were made of *nerves* or *strings*.

Your interpretation of ver. 869 is exceedingly ingenious and just. Ἁρπη is used by Nicander for any *pointed instru-*

ment in general, as a *tooth*, &c.; and στοgθυγξ, στονυξ, and equivalent words, are used in the Anthologia, and elsewhere, for that far-famed implement in question; for which άgπη is a proper term of disguise, in such a composition as the Cassandra. Observe, also, how the congenial word θοgος, from θοgω *salio*, agrees with πηδημα: and the θ' may either be omitted, or remain, as the exordium of an aggregate: "doubling *both* the water, &c." So that your conception of the verse seems every way unexceptionable and appropriate.

For myself, I seem arrived nearly at the end of my reading in this place, with my present stock of books; and my appetite is apt to flag with the hilarity of the season, and the tempting appearances of nature: so that I should not much object to a liberation at this time, with Lord Thanet and Mr. Ferguson: but

> Truditur dies die,
> Novæque pergunt interire Lunæ,

and will soon accomplish my desires, if not anticipated by a more arbitrary and speedy summons from this terrestrial existence.

I remain, Sir,

Your obliged friend,

GILBERT WAKEFIELD.

LETTER XL.

FROM MR. FOX TO MR. WAKEFIELD.

SIR, St. Anne's Hill, June 20, 1800.

I HAVE been a good deal occupied of late, which has prevented me thanking you sooner for your Letter, in which you clear some of my doubts about Lycophron. I am very glad you approve of my conjecture about ἁρπη: but it is not even necessary to it that ἁρπη should bear the figurative sense you mention. It may mean the instrument with which Saturn mutilated his father

Cœlus. I was aware the δ' or τε was very consistent with my interpretation; but to the common one it is absolutely necessary; and therefore its being absent from some of the old copies makes in favour of my guess; for, in my supposition, it may be there or not. I confess I cannot think it possible, that Lycophron, writing before the first Punic war, could speak of the Romans as he does: besides, there is a passage, which I cannot immediately lay my finger upon, foretelling an alliance between the Romans (or at least the descendants of the Trojans) and the Macedonians; which may allude either to that between the Romans and Philip, or to that between them and Ptolemy, but which, as a particular fact, could never be guessed at so long before it took place. The Prophecy in Seneca's Medea is very curious indeed. I once saw one relating to the Jesuits in some history of Ireland (not certainly Leland's), which may perhaps be the same to

which you allude. It appeared to me to be the most extraordinary thing of the kind I had ever met with; so much so, that I am very sorry I did not take a note of the book and page. I will endeavour to recover it. Homer's I do not think much of, as it is easily explained by the supposition that in his time Æneas's posterity were in power somewhere: whether in Asia, or in Europe, the words are equally applicable.

In one of your Letters, long since, you mentioned that Dawes said, that instead of ἱλασσωμεθ' ανακτος, it was in the Florentine edition ἱλασομεσθα, so that the digamma was respected. I have lately been extravagant enough to purchase the Florentine edition; and find that it has ἱλασσωμεθ', like the other editions: the line is in the A. 444.

I am truly glad that you have settled your own business. I never supposed I could have any influence with Mr. Frampton.

His Father-in-law, I think, would be glad to oblige me, and, even independently of such a wish, would be of the good-natured side of any question.

I like parts of the imitation of Juvenal very much: it is full of spirit. You do not say by whom it is.

Yours ever,

C. J. Fox.

LETTER XLI.

FROM MR. WAKEFIELD TO MR. FOX.

SIR, Dorchester Gaol, June 21, 1800.

No apology for any interval of time in noticing my Letters is at all necessary. I usually send answers immediately, partly from regular practice, and partly from want of room in this place; so that what once is dismissed from my sight on the table, is in danger of being totally forgotten. But I make no requisitions of any one.

I cannot now recollect what I said about Homer, Il. A. 444; but I probably misrepresented what Dawes asserted, from defect of memory. Common editions have ἱλασσωμεθ' ἀνακτα. My Florentine, which is now open before me, has ἱλασσωμεσθα ανακτα, which you see is removed from what is apprehended to be the truth, ἱλασομεσθα, by only very common and

accountable variations, the doubling of σ, and long for short ο. If it be in yours, as you state, ἱλασσώμεθ', it is very strange. I collated the Florentine soon after I came hither, and found it less serviceable than I expected. A good deal of suffrage in the final ν; but as much in the Etymologicon Magnum. See Od. Γ. 419. Some small confirmation of the proposed correction for Il. Α. 444. exists in Etymologicon Magnum, p. 97, in as far as ο for ω; for the author, though the passage is most corrupt, very evidently refers to the verse in question.

I am, Sir,

Your most obliged friend,

GILBERT WAKEFIELD.

LETTER XLII.

FROM MR. FOX TO MR. WAKEFIELD.

SIR, St. Anne's Hill, June 26, 1800.

It is very extraordinary, that our copies of the Florentine Homer should be so different. In mine, the dedication to which (to Peter of Medicis, the son of Lawrence) is dated 1488, it is most distinctly, as I stated, ἱλασσωμεθ'. Observe, that the ἱ is marked with the *lenis*, instead of the aspirate. As my eyes are very indifferent, I at first thought it might be a mistake of mine, and that there was a thickness at the bottom of the θ, which might stand for a σ; but I observe it is quite the same letter as in Φοιβῳ θ' ἱερην ἑκατομβην, in the preceding line; and the mark of elision at the end, instead of the α, is quite clear. Its being ἱλασσωμεσθα in your copy, is a clear justification of the reading ἱλασομεσθα, if that use

of the future is common in Homer, which, upon mere recollection, I cannot say. This variation between our copies is a very singular circumstance.

You see the turn affairs have taken in Italy. God send it may lead to a peace!

Yours ever,

C. J. Fox.

LETTER XLIII.

FROM MR. WAKEFIELD TO MR. FOX.

SIR, Dorchester Gaol, June 28, 1800

When Heath recommended a reading in Sophocles on the authority of the second Justine edition, Brunck, who had never seen that edition, nor knew indeed of its existence, made himself merry at the expense, as he supposed, of our countryman, "as if he had got an impression of Sophocles made on purpose for himself." I did not entertain so high an opinion of you, as to suppose the Fates to have gifted the

Italian typographers with a prophetic impulse for a provisionary accommodation of a Florentine Homer to your future purposes, in exclusion of all other admirers of that poet: but rather concluded, from your accuracy on these occasions, that two different impressions of this work, much at the same time, must have gone abroad, as the product of the same operation; as we know of two Aldine Demosthenes, and two Baskerville's Virgils, only distinguishable by the more knowing dealers in these articles.

The verse in question is most distinctly and unambiguously written at length in my copy, and stands the second in the right-hand page; perfectly conformable to my former representation of it. I suspect yours to be some spurious and managed copy: of the legitimacy of my own, its pedigree will not suffer me to doubt. Its original owner, of late years, was Mr. Cracherode: it is a very fine copy; but when its curious possessor procured a finer, it past over to the library of Lord Spencer; and

he, on procuring one more suited to his taste, transferred it to Edwards the bookseller, who conveyed it to my hands for a large-paper Lucretius: so that it exhibits a genealogy almost comparable to that of Agamemnon's sceptre, or Belinda's bodkin. The knowing ones, who must occasionally come in your way, will be able, I dare say, to solve your doubts, and clear up the difficulty. If a surreptitious copy has been foisted on you, it will be prudently returned to its late owner; who, if a craftsman, might be aware of its illegitimacy. But I speak merely from conjecture, founded on the facts, which our respective copies unquestionably would furnish in greater numbers, from more minute comparison of passages.

With reference to the conclusion of your favour: in other circumstances, I might say, that I was so affected, as not to know whether my head or heels were uppermost. In my present situation, I shall employ language more significant and appropriate,

if I say, that I scarcely know whether I am in a prison, or without. For that man (whom I have long revered), and for every son of peace and mercy, my aspiration is, what is inscribed on the entrance of our cloisters in Jesus College: PROSPERUM ITER FACIAS!—My spirit is with him and them.

It amazes me, that any man can pretend to believe in Revelation, (and these pretenders are very numerous,) and not see, if he read but a page of Christ's lectures in the Gospel, that his religion, and every hostile propensity, much more actual and offensive war, are not only incompatible with each other, but the most unequivocal contradiction in terms.

I remain, Sir,

Your obliged friend,

GILBERT WAKEFIELD.

Οφρα, which I omitted to mention, is very variously employed in Homer: a similar government and power of the word may be seen in verse 147 of the same book.

LETTER XLIV.

FROM MR. FOX TO MR. WAKEFIELD.

SIR, St. Anne's Hill, Oct. 17, 1800.

YOU mentioned to me, some time since, a wish to have the perusal of some MSS. of the Classics that may be in private libraries. I shall go to Mr. Coke's, at Holkham, the beginning of next month; who has, as I understand, several, which I will look at: but if there are any particular authors of more consequence to you than others, I wish you would give me a hint, and I will endeavour to get the loan of them for you. I have not been able yet to account for the difference between my copy of the Florence Homer and yours; but have desired an intelligent person to examine such other copies as may fall in his way.

I am, Sir,

Your friend and servant,

C. J. FOX.

LETTER XLV.

FROM MR. WAKEFIELD TO MR. FOX.

SIR, Dorchester Gaol, Oct. 18, 1800.

I THANK you for this recollection of my request. The loan of any Greek MS, prior in date to the invention of printing, will be acceptable; of any poet, except Aristophanes; and of prose writers, Clemens Alexandrinus and Philo Judæus. Of the Latin poets, Silius Italicus, Valerius Flaccus; and Virgil, if very antient and uncollated, otherwise a MS. of him cannot be presumed of much utility.

Suffer me to employ this opportunity of thanking you for your Address to your Electors: it was seasonable, spirited, and judicious. I know no men, who pour out such an abundance of practical good sense on all subjects, intelligibly to the meanest capacities and instructively to the best, as Dr. Paley (I wish that he did not sophis-

ticate too frequently against his convictions, in vindication of his craft), Dr. Priestley, and the man who is now addressed

By his obliged servant,

GILBERT WAKEFIELD.

LETTER XLVI.

FROM MR. FOX TO MR. WAKEFIELD.

SIR, St. Anne's Hill, Jan. 26, 1801.

I WAS at Holkham this year a much shorter time than usual; and I am ashamed to say, that I could not find time to do what I certainly had voluntarily engaged to do, by searching the library. Partly a *malus pudor*, and partly an expectation of hearing from Mr. Wilbraham that he had repaired my omission, have prevented me hitherto from giving you this account; but it is the true one, nor will I attempt at any palliation. Clemens Alex-

andrinus, if I remember right, was the author you particularly mentioned, as a manuscript you most desired.

I am much afraid that it will be much longer than you seem to think, before Europe will be delivered from the horrors of war; if that be the delivery to which you look. If you mean only a deliverance from the odious projects of our Ministers and their allies, I consider that as already in effect accomplished.

I am at present engaged in an attempt to write a History of the times immediately preceding and following the Revolution of 1688. Whether my attempt will ever come to any thing, I know not; but, whether it does or not, I shall grudge very much the time it takes away from my attention to poetry and antient literature, which are studies far more suitable to my taste. However, though these studies are a good deal interrupted, they have not wholly ceased; and therefore I should be obliged to you, if you would tell me your opinion

concerning the best edition of Æschylus. I see, in a Catalogue now before me, that I can have Pauw's for four guineas, which, if it be the best, I do not think much. I have no edition of this poet at all; and, consequently, have not of late years read any of his plays, except the Eumenides in your collection. Some passages are grand indeed; but there is a hardness of style, and too continual an aim at grandeur, to be quite to my taste. I think I have heard that there are detached editions of some of his plays that are worth having. Now I am troubling you upon these subjects, If I have time only to read one or two of Aristophanes' plays, which would you recommend me? I never read any of them.

I suppose Porson's parenthesis, in his Note on the Phœnissæ, ver. 1230, is meant to apply to the Tragedians exclusively. Whether, even so applied, it be true, I doubt; but, if applied generally, it is ridiculous. The parenthesis is, "Neque enim diphthongus ante brevem vocalem elidi potest."

The more I consider the passage I once before mentioned to you in Lycophron, the more I am convinced that it is morally impossible that a man living in the time of Ptolemy Philadelphus (that is, before the first Punic war) could have written the verses concerning Rome, beginning at ver. 1226; still less those beginning at 1446: and yet I believe nothing of the sort is more generally believed than that Lycophron did live in the time of Ptolemy Philadelphus. Tzetzes takes notice of the objection; but only cavils at the manner in which it is stated, without answering the substance of it. The other Commentators say nothing about it; only, as to ver. 1446, one of them is satisfied with saying that he does not know what it alludes to.

I have to return you thanks for the Dio Chrysostom, which, however, I have not yet looked into.

I am very truly, Sir,

Your obliged servant,

C. J. Fox.

P.S. I cannot clear up the mystery of my Florence edition of Homer, differing from yours in the word ἱλασσωμεσθ'. I begin to be afraid that mine must be a spurious copy; but it has not the appearance of it. I have not seen any other Florence Homer lately, to compare it with; but I have commissioned a friend to examine one.

LETTER XLVII.

FROM MR. WAKEFIELD TO MR. FOX.

SIR, Dorchester Gaol, Jan. 27, 1801.

MSS, I know, are so scarce in this country, even in public libraries, that I had formed no flattering expectations from your researches at Mr. Coke's; and, of course, shall feel but little disappointment at an unpropitious issue.

Several visitors to me at this place had mentioned your engagement on that part of our political history which your Letter specifies; and I cannot but lament that you express yourself with any uncertainty respecting its accomplishment; a failure which would occasion lasting regret, to your friends in particular, and your contemporaries at large: nor do I learn with pleasure that your affections are not so cordially in unison with this important and interesting occupation, as with other studies, poetry and antient literature.

You will do well to purchase that edition of Pauw's Æschylus, unless it be a very inferior copy: four guineas, as times go, is a moderate price. Pauw contains the whole of Stanley, who was a very modest and learned man, of the Derby family; and the same who wrote the Lives of the Philosophers. Pauw's own Notes are of little worth: he was a noisy, boastful, and injudicious critic. The book is very neatly printed, and pleasant to the eye. Æschylus is pompous, but frequently sublime: his principal defect, as a dramatic writer, seems want of action. His Prometheus is interesting, as a collection of antient mythology and history, not so distinctly preserved elsewhere: and Milton's Satan was most evidently formed on that character. The Septem ad Thebas is a fine delineation of heroic manners, but is made up, almost wholly, of descriptive speeches. His Persæ is not very interesting, and may be considered as a mere sacrifice to Grecian vanity. In the Agamemnon are some very

sublime passages: part of a chorus in dialogue, ver. 1560...1569, contains the bitterest irony, the most cutting insult, that ever was written, I think, by man. One feels more respect for the poet, from his distinction as a citizen, and his gallantry at the battle of Marathon.

Schutz has published Æschylus: three volumes had come out before my arrival hither; and two more are expected, containing the last play, index, &c. They are become, I believe, enormously dear, and very scarce. I would not advise you to look after them, except you feel your thirst increased for a more elaborate perusal, after reading Stanley. The text of Æschylus is in a much less correct state than that of the other Tragedians.

The two most popular, and most approved, plays of Aristophanes, are the Ranæ and Plutus: but, to say the truth, Plato and Aristophanes are the only two celebrated authors of antiquity whom I never could read through. Often have I

determined to surmount my disinclination; and as often recoiled, in the middle of my enterprise:

——— ter saxea tentat
Limina nequicquam; ter fessus valle resedit.

If a man loves nastiness and bawdry, he may find both to satiety, *usque ad delicias votorum,* in his Lysistratus, and other plays. I do not profess much squeamishness and prudery on these points, as a student: but an author whose object is principally pleasure, and not utility, must bring with him either sublime sentiment, magnificent language, or sonorous verse, to rivet my affection;—and there is nothing of these in Aristophanes. Pure diction, easy versification, and coarse wit, are his excellencies. But the principal obstacle is, that obscurity which attends all writers whose chief object has been the delineation of vulgar manners, and the transitory peculiarities of the day. Brunck's edition is the most correct: but you would scarcely understand him without the Scholia, which are not in

him, but may be read to most advantage in Kuster. Perhaps you will prefer procuring the common London edition, of the beginning of this century, which is easily procured, and contains the *Nubes* and *Plutus,* with the Scholia.

At the desire of the Editor, I have reviewed, in the Critical Review, two months ago, Porson's *Hecuba* and his *Orestes,* for the coming month. Porson will know the author; but I never yet did any thing in this way which I wished to be concealed, though not ambitious to divulge it; nor am I at all fond of the Reviewer's employment, nor engage in it but on particular solicitation.

If I live to see London again, I shall take great pleasure in mentioning your difficulty on Lycophron to a gentleman, who has studied him more than any man living, I suppose. He is vicar or rector of some parish in Bread Street: his name is Meek; and he is rightly so called; for a more pacific, gentle, unassuming, human creature

never did exist. He was somewhat senior to me at Cambridge.

Some of my friends have very much urged me to give Lectures on the Classics; and, on a mature consideration of the project, I mean to make the attempt, by beginning with the second Æneid, when I leave this place. I shall not wish it to be regarded as a benevolent scheme, in the least degree; but as one, in which those on the spot, and interested in such pursuits, may expect to receive something like an equivalent for their money. When my proposals are digested and printed, I shall take the liberty of sending you one; more as a token of respect for your judgment, than with any desire of troubling your services on this occasion.

I remain, Sir,

Your respectful friend,

GILBERT WAKEFIELD.

LETTER XLVIII.

FROM THE SAME TO THE SAME.

SIR, Dorchester Gaol, April 2, 1801.

I once mentioned, if I rightly recollect, my intention of troubling you with the inclosed plan; supposing it probable that you might meet with an opportunity of speaking on the subject, if you should be in town.

My Printer, I expect, will have conveyed to you a small performance on the versification of the Greek epic writers. This trifle, which I could have printed in this country, since my commencement of authorship, for six pounds, and could now print in Paris for less than four pounds, has cost now no less than seventeen pounds. I congratulate myself more and more on abandoning my Lexicon, as the full list of subscribers would not have defrayed the bills of the stationer and printer. Indeed, all private adventure in the classical way,

to any extent, is become utterly impracticable in this island; and must benumb the activity, and destroy the engagements, of those who reposed the future comfort of their lives, in some measure, on these pursuits.

Our joy on the near approach of liberation has been tempered by a severe affliction—the loss of our youngest child, on Sunday last. To express the miseries which my absence has occasioned to my wife and family, during an agonizing illness, of alternate hope and despair, would look like an ostentation of sorrow, to all, but those who have been exercised in similar circumstances, by a similar calamity.

I remain, Sir,

Your respectful friend,

GILBERT WAKEFIELD.

LETTER XLIX.

FROM MR. FOX TO MR. WAKEFIELD.

SIR, St. Anne's Hill, April 5, 1801.

I AM exceedingly concerned to hear of the loss you have sustained, as well as of the additional suffering which your family has experienced (as of course they must), from your separation from them during so trying a calamity.

You mentioned to me before, your notion of reading Lectures upon the Classics, but not as a point upon which you had fully determined. If I can be of any use in promoting your views, I will not fail to do so: for in proportion as classical studies are an enjoyment to myself (and they are certainly a very great one), I wish them to be diffused as widely as possible.

I have run over, with great pleasure, your dissertation upon the metre of the writers of Greek hexameters. There are one or two

things that I am not quite sure that I understand, but upon which I have not time, just now, to trouble you with my doubts. The observations upon verses of the following form,

Εγνως, Εννοσιγαιε—εμην εν στηθεσι βουλην·

and on the aspirate in the pronouns οἱ, ὁς, ἑος, always telling as a consonant; appear to me to be quite new, and very striking. I had myself observed how sparing Homer is in leaving a vowel short between two consonants, though one of them be a liquid; but it seems strange, that the author of the Argonautics, which go by the name of Orpheus, should have been less scrupulous in this licence than poets of a period more distant from Homer. That poem is supposed (is it not?) to have been written as early as the age of Pisistratus.

Yours ever,

C. J. Fox.

LETTER L.

FROM MR. WAKEFIELD TO MR. FOX.

SIR, Dorchester Gaol, April 6, 1801.

THE project of my Lectures is a very important event in my future life; but one, whose success appears, I own, extremely doubtful to myself.

The principal points of my metrical dissertation seem tolerably well ascertained. Some difficulties will arise of impossible solution, partly from inexplicable corruptions, and partly, perhaps, from the inconsistency and incorrectness of the writers themselves. That hiatus in the middle of the third foot I once mentioned to Dr. Parr, and desired his opinion on it; but, as he revolted at the very mention of it, and condemned it as a peculiarity unheard of, and inadmissible, I made no reply, but concluded it to

have been unobserved by all readers but myself.

You quote me as speaking of οἱ, ὅς, and ἑός: whereas, my rule is not true of this last, nor of ἑοι, the substantive in the dative case. I suspect, that, in many cases, the aspirate has passed into a letter; and that ἑοι, by the rule of dactyls, should frequently be substituted for οἱ. In antient inscriptions, the aspirate is found expressed by half the H, thus ├, which, from quick writing, might easily pass into an ε, by the loss of two angles; as the present aspirate ʽ is exhibited in the Apollonius Rhodius with capital letters, and other books, in its primitive shape ├.

The author of the Argonautic Expedition, under the name of Orpheus, probably interwove, in his poem, verses from purer authors, who had previously treated this subject; of whose works various copies once existed, as appears from fragments in Suidas, and from other testimonies: but the present poem was evidently put into the

form now extant by a writer of very late date, and probably some centuries posterior to the Christian æra.

I remain, Sir,

Your respectful friend,

GILBERT WAKEFIELD.

LETTER LI.

FROM MR FOX TO MR WAKEFIELD.

SIR, St Anne's Hill, April 13, 1801.

YOUR story of Theseus is excellent, as applicable to our present Rulers: if you could point out to me where I could find it, I should be much obliged to you. The Scholiast on Aristophanes is too wide a description.

The whole affair relating to the late changes is as unintelligible to me as to you. That there is some sort of juggle in the business, appears to me certain; but to what degree is difficult to ascertain.

I think, as you do, the success of your proposed Lectures doubtful; but am rather inclined to be sanguine: if I can do any thing to promote it, you may depend upon me. The second book, upon which you propose to begin, is a delightful composition. If the lines omitted in the Medici Manuscript are spurious, they are, I think, the happiest imitation of Virgil's manner that I ever saw. I am indeed so unwilling to believe them any other than genuine, that rather than I would consent to such an opinion, I should be inclined to think that Virgil himself had written, and afterwards erased them, on account of their inconsistency with the account he gives of Helen, in the sixth book.

I certainly quoted you erroneously, about *ἑος*, *ἑοι*, &c.; and I perfectly understand your observation to apply only to *ἑο*, *οἵ*, *ἑ*, *ὅς*, when in the possessive sense; and I suppose to *εὗ*, when used for *ἑο*. *οὗ*, for *ἑο*, is not, I believe, used in Homer: *οὗ*, for *οἷο*, follows of course, I suppose, the rule of *ὅς*. I do

not know whether you have remarked how very rarely in the Iliad the final iota of the dative plural is omitted before a consonant; and even, of the few instances that do appear, there are several in which there are various readings. In the one, therefore, which you mention on another account, it is an additional reason for preferring your reading;

Χειρεσιν αμφοτερησιν ανηρ φεροι·

because in the other, αμφοτερης φεροι ανηρ, the final iota is omitted. The preference of dactyls in the Greek hexameter Poets is certainly pretty general; but more remarkable, I think, in Apollonius, than in any other; except, perhaps, the Doric Poets. In Homer there appears to me to be more variety in this respect; and his versification is therefore, to my ear, the most agreeable: but there may be, and I suspect there is, a great deal of fancy in this, on our part, who are so ignorant of the true antient mode of pronunciation. Virgil is, I believe, the most spondaïc amongst the Latin Poets;

and sometimes evidently with a view to a particular expression, in which he is often very successful. I believe the following lines are in the 3d book of the Æneid, but I am not sure:

——Secretæ Troades actâ
Amissum Anchisen flebant, cunctæque profundum
Pontum aspectabant flentes; heu! tot vada fessis, &c.

Every foot is here a spondee, except those in the fifth place; and it seems to me to have a wonderful effect. There are two lines in the Iliad, one in the Λ. 130; the other in Ψ; which, as they are now written, consist of six spondees each; but I suppose they should be written,

Ατρ*ΕΙ*δης· τω δ' αυτ' εκ διφρ*ΟΟ* (or διφρο*F*ο)—,

and

Ψυχην κικλησκων Πατροκλ*ΕΕ*ος δ*ΕΕ*λοιο.

I remain, Sir,

Yours ever,

C. J. Fox.

LETTER LII

FROM MR. WAKEFIELD TO MR. FOX.

SIR, Dorchester Gaol, April 14, 1801.

My Aristophanes with the Scholia is not here. If I am right in my recollection, the story probably occurs in the Scholia on the Frogs, and would soon be found by reference to the name of Theseus in Kuster's Index. Nor is my Burman's Virgil with me, whose margin contains my references: there I should probably have found the desired passage, at Æn. vi. 617; and there, I doubt not, you will find references in Heyne's Virgil, which will conduct you to other authors of the story, Apollodorus and Pausanias, or their commentators. Heyne, you will see, mentions the fable without its jocular appendage; not foreseeing your wishes on this occasion.

Your supposition, that the verses in Æn. ii. were Virgil's own, and omitted by him,

with the reason for that omission, pleases me entirely.

Your opinion of a versification more dactylic in Apollonius Rhodius than Homer will scarcely continue with you, I think, after another trial or two. Where Homer appears spondaïc, the cause is assignable often to a modern orthography, agreeably to a just remark of your own at the conclusion of your Letter. It will scarcely be disputed, I believe, that the former verse, which you cite, Il. Λ. 130, should be thus written, as far as the present point is concerned:

Ατρεϝιδης· τοο δ' αυτ' εκ διφρο' εγουναζεσθην·

which makes great alteration of celerity.

Your passage of Virgil is not in Æn. iii. but Æn. v. 613, where you should observe the sluggishness of the spondaïc measures to be relieved by two elisions, which, with a suitable rapidity of enunciation, become equivalent to dactyls. Have you never remarked also, in that same book, a stroke of nature and pathos no where surpassed, and,

as far as is known, unborrowed from the Greeks? What strains of immortality from v. 765 to 772! Heyne miserably mars the passage, by putting *nomen*, for *numen* (the beauty of which he did not discover), into the text. *Numen* is the δαιμων, the EXISTING CIRCUMSTANCES, chiefly of a *melancholy complexion* (as those of our time and country), which influences or governs the man and his life at that crisis; and the verse may be well compared with Æn. iii. 372. where also Heyne appears to be inaccurate.

Your remark on the unfrequency of the termination ης in Homer, compared with succeeding Ionic writers, is entirely just.

My reason for beginning my Lectures with the second Æneid was its superior importance to the first, and its priority in order to the other important books; which to me are, iii. v. vi. vii. and viii.

I remain, Sir,

Your respectful friend,

GILBERT WAKEFIELD.

LETTER LIII.

FROM MR. FOX TO MR. WAKEFIELD.

SIR, St. Anne's Hill, April 13, 1801.

I AM much obliged to you for your Letter; and found immediately, from Kuster's Index, the passage in question. It is in a note upon 'Ιππεις, v. 1365. The verses you refer to in the 5th Æneid are indeed delightful; indeed I think that sort of pathetic is Virgil's great excellence in the Æneid, and that in that way he surpasses all other poets of every age and nation, except, perhaps (and only perhaps), Shakspeare. It is on that account that I rank him so very high; for sure to excel in that style which speaks to the heart is the greatest of all excellence. I am glad you mention the eighth book as one of those you most admire. It has always been a peculiar favourite with me. Evander's speech upon parting with his son is, I think, the most beautiful thing in the whole, especially

the part from v. 574; and is, as far as I know, wholly unborrowed. What is more remarkable is, that it has not, I believe, been often attempted to be imitated. It is so indeed in Valerius Flaccus, lib. i. v. 323, but not, I think, very successfully.

Dum metus est, nec adhuc dolor——

goes too minutely into the philosophical reason to make with propriety a part of the speech. It might have done better as an observation of the poet's, in his own person; or still better, perhaps, it would have been, to have left it to the reader. The passage in Virgil is, I think, beyond any thing.

Sin aliquem infandum casum——

is nature itself. And then the tenderness in turning towards Pallas,

Dum te, care puer! &c.

In short, it has always appeared to me divine. On the other hand, I am sorry and surprised, that, among the capital books, you should omit the fourth. All that part

of Dido's speech that follows,

Num fletu ingemuit nostro?——

is surely of the highest style of excellence, as well as the description of her last impotent efforts to retain Æneas, and of the dreariness of her situation after his departure.

I know it is the fashion to say Virgil has taken a great deal in this book from Apollonius; and it is true that he has taken some things, but not nearly so much as I had been taught to expect, before I read Apollonius. I think Medea's speech, in the fourth Argonaut. v. 356, is the part he has made most use of. There are some very peculiar *breaks* there, which Virgil has imitated certainly, and which I think are very beautiful and expressive: I mean, particularly, v. 382 in Apollonius, and v. 380 in Virgil. To be sure, the application is different, but the manner is the same: and that Virgil had the passage before him at the time, is evident from what follows:

——Μνησαιο δε και ποτ' εμοιο,
στρευγομενος καματοισι,——

compared with

Supplicia hausurum scopulis et nomine Dido
Sæpe vocaturum.——

It appears to me, upon the whole, that Ovid has taken more from Apollonius than Virgil.

I was interrupted as I was writing this on Sunday; and have been prevented since, by company, from going on. There is another passage in Apollonius, lib. iii. 453, which Virgil has imitated too, very closely, lib. iv. 4. &c. and in which I confess that he has fallen very short of the original. Before I leave Apollonius, let me ask you, Whether in Medea's speech, in the fourth book, to which I have before alluded in ver. 381, the insertion of ου in the manner it is there, or at least the collocation of it, is not very unusual and awkward? With respect to the comparison between Homer and him, in point of dactyls, I cannot help being a little obstinate in my former opinion.

I think I would even venture to put it to this trial: Let all the long vowels and diphthongs in Homer be resolved into two vowels, that can be so, consistently with the metre; and leave those in Apollonius as we find them; and, I say, the spondees in Homer would still exceed those in Apollonius. If you change εν into ενι, and ελθειν into ελθεμεν, &c. in one, it would be fair to do the same, of course, in the other. My remark, with respect to the datives plural in Homer, is not confined to those in ησι; but extends also to those in οισι: the final iota is very rarely omitted in either of them, except, of course, where it is elided by a subsequent vowel. Heyne's substitution of *nomen* for *numen*, in the lines of the fifth Æneid, appears to me, as to you, very absurd; but it is fair to say, that in my Roman edition of Virgil, in which the text is taken from the Medici MS, notice is taken of various readings, viz. *cœlum* in the Vatican, and *nomen* in the Leyden; and then it is added, " *In codice olim erat*

NOMEN." By the *codice*, without any addition, I presume is meant the Medici; from which, as I said, the text is uniformly professed to be taken. What difficulty Heyne can find in regard to *numen*, Æn. iii. ver. 372, is still more incomprehensible: but I have not his edition, nor ever had an opportunity of looking much into it.

Here let me finish this unconscionable Letter: but I have dwelt the longer upon Virgil's pathetic, because his wonderful excellence in that particular has not, in my opinion, been in general sufficiently noticed. The other beauties of the eighth Æneid, such as the Rites of Hercules, and the apostrophe to him, both of which Ovid has so successfully imitated in the beginning of the fourth Metamorphosis; the story of Cacus; the shield; and, above all, the description of Evander's town, and of the infancy of Rome, which appears to me, in its way, to be all but equal to the account of Alcinoüs, in the Odyssey, have been, I believe, pretty generally celebrated; and

yet I do not recollect to have seen the eighth book classed with the second, fourth, and sixth, which are the general favourites.

I am, with great regard, Sir,

Yours ever,

C. J. Fox.

LETTER LIV

FROM MR. WAKEFIELD TO MR. FOX.

SIR, Dorchester Gaol, April 22, 1801.

My reason for omitting Æn. iv., in the list of those on which I proposed to give Lectures, was not a disparaging opinion of its worth; for, if the delineation of human passions, in their most operative and interesting circumstances, be meritorious, Virgil's success in that book has attained to merit of the highest kind; but because it contains passages (such particularly as ver.

318, less delicate, perhaps, than its parallel, Soph. Aj. 521.) which would lead to a discomposure of decorum in a miscellaneous assembly; and because the *dramatic* appears to me less calculated for public exposition than *narration* and *description;* in both which Virgil supereminently excels. As to the second book, with which I commence (if I do commence), the whole imposture of Sinon, the catastrophe of Laocoön, and all connected with them, are, and always were to me, the most unpalatable parts of Virgil, and through which I always work my way with weariness and impatience.

That intermixture of antient history and primæval manners in Æn. viii. very much recommends that book to my fancy; as the enumeration of the warriors is the capital excellence of the seventh; and, in my mind, as it exceeds every thing of the same kind in Homer, has nothing comparable to it within the same compass, in Greek and Roman poetry. Apollonius deserves great praise on that article; but then, exclusive

of the sentiment, the dignity of Virgilian language, the magnificence and pomp of his versification, who has equalled of antient or modern artists? Evander's farewell speech to Pallas justly merits your applauses. I suppose that I may have repeated to myself the twelve last verses of it, once a month, for these twenty-seven years last past, upon a moderate average computation. The epilogue to the same subject, Æn. xii. ver. 139—182, is little, if at all, inferior. The part of Evander's speech, which you quote, has something heavy and unfinished in the monotonous terminations of the adjoining words; which the poet, I am inclined to think, would have corrected on revisal:

Sin aliq*uem infandum casum*——.

Æn. iv. 457—469, is finely imagined, and imitated, with great success, by Ovid, and Pope in his Eloïsa.

As for Virgil's imitations of Apollonius Rhodius, they detract very little from his sum of excellence. The characteristic

merit of a poet is founded on his general delineation of human character, with the main conformation of his poem, and the concatenation and correspondence of its parts; not on a few incidental obligations to his predecessors. On the whole, I read Virgil's Dido with more pleasure than the Medea of his original: one appears to me somewhat artificial and indistinct; the other, all perspicuity and nature.

Your hesitation at Apollonius Rhodius, iv. 381, and mention of the difficulty in your Letter, furnishes me with an additional proof, to the many which I have before experienced, how important the suggestions and communications of another are found, even with respect to passages the most familiar, and to a superficial view the most unexceptionable. I perceived instantaneously, on turning to it at your suggestion, what never else, in all probability, would have presented itself to my mind—that a slight error, which I think you will acknowledge, occasions the awkwardness in

question. We should read, I am persuaded:

Ηε μαλ' ευκλεινης; Τινα δ' ΑΥ τισιν ηε βαρειαν
Ατην ου σμυγερως, κ.τ.λ.

"*Nay, rather, on the other hand*—:" which is perfectly consonant, in my opinion, both to the power of the particle, and the exigence of the context. But is the passage unexceptionable yet? I think not. Brunck perceived a difficulty, it is plain, though he says nothing; and he has accordingly attempted to remove it by an interrogation at ευκλεινης. But does ηε ever introduce a question, unless another ηε, or η, precedes? I believe not: and, without an interrogation, it is made in Shaw, and others, equivalent to η *certe*, or δη: which is inadmissible again; for ηε never has any such power. I read, therefore, and the reasons for corruption are obvious and probable,

Η μαλ' ευκλεινης·——

"*Certainly very honourable!*" sarcastically and ironically; which seems quite in cha-

racter, and escapes all embarrassment and exception of phraseology.

You have a right, I believe, from an experimental comparison of a few passages, not to be, as you candidly express yourself, a *little obstinate* in your opinion respecting the superior frequency of dactyls in Apoll. Rhodius to Homer, but *greatly persevering* in that opinion. Homer's deficiency, however, seems ascribable to the more frequent recurrence, and greater number, of his *proper* names; many of which are spondaïc in their syllables: Αιας, Ατρειδης, Ηρη, Αθηναιη, Κιρκη, Ποσειδαων, Νεστωρ, Ἑκτωρ, Αχαιοι, Οδυσσευς, Πηλειδης, Αχιλλευς, Καλυψω, Απολλων, Ἑρμης, Ἑρμειας, Αφροδιτη, φιλομμειδης, &c. perpetually recurring.

I did not censure Heyne, or did not mean to censure him, at Æn. ver. 768, for preferring *nomen* as his own conjecture, but for accepting this reading of the MSS. to the exclusion of the other. You surprise me exceedingly by saying that you have not Heyne. I know it has been fashionable,

of late, with many, to undervalue his exertions on Virgil, and particularly with the Eton men, who *primi rerum omnium esse volunt;* but I would not want his edition, and Burman's, on any consideration: they are absolutely essential, in my judgment, not only to a *critical perusal,* but to an *elegant perception* of this most accomplished and delightful author.

My Lectures are, with me, an object of great importance: for, without the assistance of this project, all my schemes of future editions must be frustrated, under the present conditions of this country,—the monstrous price of printing in the dead languages, and the enormous rise on paper, such as to be doubled since my sepulture in this *delectable* abode. Should this attempt on Virgil meet with tolerable countenance, I had meditated a similar experiment on a Greek Poet, in the winter.

A thought comes into my head, which I do not recollect to have imparted to you before. A very imperfect notion is enter-

tained in general of the copiousness of the Latin language, by those who confine themselves to what are styled the Augustan writers. The old Comedians and Tragedians, with Ennius and Lucilius, were the great repositories of learned and vigorous expression: and their language, with the diction of Lucretius and Virgil, is, to a certainty, largely preserved to us in some writers, little read, but to me, I own, the sources of much amusement, and more information; several of them at the same time characterized by a truly masculine and original eloquence: Tertullian, Arnobius, Apuleius, A. Gellius, and Ammianus Marcellinus. Their words are usually marked in Dictionaries as inelegant and of suspicious authority; when they are, in reality, the most genuine remains of pure Roman composition. I have ever regarded the loss of the old Roman Poets, particularly Ennius and Lucilius, from the light which they would have thrown on the formations of the Latin language, and its derivation from

the Æolian Greek, as the severest calamity ever sustained by philological learning.

Another thought also, of a different complexion, recurs to memory. I often wonder, that your highly respectable friends in the House of Commons, who are tossing their words with such wonderful perseverance, day after day, to every wind that blows, when the objection of no petitions coming against the suspension of the Habeas-Corpus Act, &c. is urged upon them, by Ministry, do not reply, by stating the inefficacy of petitions in one very singular and apposite example,—the case of the Slave Trade; on which occasion few counties and towns in England, to the best of my recollection, were wanting in this effort; with what success I need not mention.

The stations of no men in this kingdom do I ever feel myself inclined to regard with an eye of envy, except those of the Masters and Tutors of Colleges in Oxford and Cambridge; who are possessed of all possible implements and opportunities to

pursue and encourage literature, and continue sleeping

—— *μαλα μακρον*
ατερμονα νηγρετον ὑπνον,

over their desirable appointments. The Masters, also, of our great public Schools are placed, to my apprehension, in enviable situations. In short, education is of such incomparable value, in my opinion, that I cannot help coveting the condition of every man who is rendered capable of conducting it with efficiency and extent.

I remain, Sir,

Your obedient servant,

GILBERT WAKEFIELD.

LETTER LV

FROM MR. FOX TO MR. WAKEFIELD

SIR, St. Anne's Hill, April 28, 1801.

I AM much obliged to you for your caution about Heyne's Virgil; and if I purchase it at all, I will wait for the new edition. When I was a book buyer, in my younger days, it was not in existence; and lately I have bought but few classical books, except Greek ones; and some Latin authors, of whom I had before *no* edition. I had once a good many editions of Virgil; but having had frequent occasions to make presents, and Virgil being always a proper book for that purpose, I have now only the fine Roman one, in three volumes folio; a school Delphin; a Variorum; and Martyn's Georgics. I am glad to find that you are not the heretic about the fourth book that I suspected you to be. Your reason for omitting it may be a very

good one. I think the coarsest thing in the whole book (not indeed in point of indecency, but in want of sentiment) is ver. 502. '*She thought she would take it as she did the last time,*' is surely vulgar and gross to the last degree. How very strange it appears to me, that that character of perfection or faultlessness, which so justly belongs to the Georgics, should have been so frequently applied to the Æneid! and yet even in Quintilian there is the expression of "Quanto eminentioribus vincimur, æqualitate pensamus," or something like it, which, according to the common interpretation of the words, seems to justify such an opinion, as far as his authority goes. I am much obliged to you for referring me to the passage in the Ajax, which is exceedingly beautiful, and certainly more delicate than Virgil's; and yet, I own, I should never have thought there was much indelicacy in *si quid dulce meum*; but perhaps I am not so nice upon such subjects as others are. By the way, in the Ajax, v. 514,

there is ὅ τι βλεπω, another instance in refutation of Porson's absurd assertion in the Note upon the Orestes, ver. 64. "ubi verbum in brevem vocalem desinit," &c. Is not τι a short syllable? and is it not followed by βλ, two consonants "quæ brevem esse paterentur"? In short, I doubt whether, except the play he was actually publishing, and the Phœnissæ, he could have found another wherein there was not a contradiction to his position. The epilogue, as you call it, to the story of Pallas, and which you erroneously quote as being in Æneid xii. (it is in Æneid xi.) is indeed capital, but not equal, in my opinion, to the parting speech: but then, *I* think, that nothing *is*. There appears to me something harsh and difficult in the construction in the last lines of the epilogue. It may, perhaps, be owing to the habit we are in of comparing him to Homer, the most perspicuous of all poets; but, to say the truth, perspicuity does not appear to me to be among Virgil's chief excellencies. As we

are upon the subject of Pallas (in which the poet is always peculiarly happy), I hope you admire the two lines, Æn. x. 515, 516. I quite agree with you as to Sinon and Laocoön; though some of those passages, which are become so trite as quotations, are in themselves very good; such as "Timeo Danaos," "Hoc Ithacus velit," &c.; but if Sinon and Laocoön are cold and forced, the Death of Priam, the Apparition of Hector, &c. amply compensate. Your notion, in respect to poets borrowing from each other, seems almost to come up to mine, who have often been laughed at by my friends as a systematic defender of plagiarism: indeed, I got Lord Holland, when a school-boy, to write some verses in praise of it; and, in truth, it appears to me, that the greatest poets have been most guilty, if guilt there be, in these matters. Dido is surely far superior to Medea in general; but there are some parts of Apollonius, such as lib. iii. from 453 to 463, and from 807 to 816, that appear to me unrivalled. Your

correction in Arg. iv. 380, from ου to αυ, must please me; for I had thought myself of changing the other ου, in the following line, to αυ; but I dare say your collocation is better. The difficulty also of ηε for η or δη had struck me; but seeing no notice taken of it by the editor, I was too diffident of my own knowledge of the language to pronounce it to be wrong. In my edition (Shaw's octavo), it is without the note of interrogation; and I think such a note would take off greatly from the spirit of the passage; besides the impropriety, which you suggest, of the use of ηε, even in that case. If it is a question, it should be, I suppose, either ηϱα or ἆϱα. Your emendation, η μαλ' ευκλειης, seems to take away all difficulty, and is quite simple. By the way, a few lines below, the pronoun σε is repeated without any apparent cause; or any elegance, that I can see, in the repetition. I suppose the second σ' may be omitted, and that εμα may stand in that part of the verse without it; or if not, should the first σε be

changed into τε, "εκ δε ΤΕ πατρης"? Your observation on the utility of communications upon these subjects may possibly be the cause of my making many trifling ones upon them. There is a strong instance of Apollonius's delight in dactyls, in one of the passages quoted, lib. iii. ver. 813, where he changes Homer's ὁμηλικιης ερατεινης into περιγηθεος. The loss of the older Roman writers is certainly the greatest that could have happened to philology; and probably, too, on account of their own merit, is in every view a considerable one. Of the more modern writers, whom you mention, I have never read any but A. Gellius. I bought Apuleius last year, with an intention to read him, but something or other has always prevented me. I never saw one quotation from Tertullian that did not appear to me full of eloquence of the best sort; and have often thought, on that account, of buying an edition of him: but have been rather discouraged, from supposing that it might be necessary to know

more than I do of the controversies in which he was engaged, to relish him properly.

With respect to your Lectures, I should think that Latin would succeed better than Greek authors; but this is very uncertain. From the audience, however, which you may have upon the first, it will not be difficult to collect what probability there is of getting as good, or a better one, to the second.

It would be very good in argument, to state the inefficacy of the petitions on the Slave Trade, in the way you mention; and I do believe, that, in fact, the supposed inefficacy of petitions has been one of the great causes of the supineness, or rather lethargy, of the country: but it is not true, that petitions, though they have been ultimately unsuccessful, have been therefore wholly inefficacious. The petitions in 1797 produced, as Mr. Pitt says (and I suspect he says truly), the negotiation at Lisle: no great good, you will say; but still they

were not wholly inefficacious. And even with regard to the Slave Trade, I conceive the great numbers which have voted with us, sometimes amounting to a majority, have been principally owing to petitions. Even now, in this last stage of degradation, I am not sure that if the people were to petition generally (but it must be very generally) that it would be without effect.

Your attention to the unfortunate wretches you speak of must do you the highest honour, in the eyes of all men, even of Tory justices; and that is saying θαρσαλεον επος.

Yours ever,

C. J. Fox.

P. S. According to your maxim of not allowing the valuable article of paper to go unemployed, I will trouble you with one more question, relative to Ajax, v. 511. and that is, how do you construe διοισεται there? Stevens says "διοισεται, apud Sophoclem '*deportabitur*'," as if it were a peculiar use of the word by that poet. But I do not think

deportabitur will do in this place well. The Latin version in my edition, that is, Johnson's, printed at Eton, says *deseretur;* but how διοισεται, which I suppose to be the future middle of διαφερεσθαι, is to mean *deseretur*, I do not conceive.

C. J. F.



LETTER LVI.

FROM MR. WAKEFIELD TO MR. FOX.

SIR, Dorchester Gaol, April 29, 1801

YOUR Variorum Virgil, if Emmenesius's, is a good book, and contains Servius's Exposition; without which every Virgil is defective, on account of that grammarian's antiquity and real merit. There is, in the British Museum, an unpublished MS. of the same grammarian's, a Vocabulary of Synonymes: and every thing of this kind, which will soon perish for ever, and which abounds every where, should be published: and these helps to literature, if a national

concern, would not all amount to one's day's expenditure by frensy and corruption.

Æn. iv. 502, is a very difficult passage, and unintelligible, I own, to me. If *quam* be genuine, the construction must be, *quam evenit in morte Sychæi*; but where can such another construction with the comparative be found? Your acceptation, in that case, must be admitted. I had conjectured, I see, *jam* for *quam*: and I conceived the general sentiment to be this: "As Dido "had endured that great calamity, under "lamentable circumstances (the death of "Sychæus by her own *brother*, Pygmalion), "without such an act of desperation as "suicide; her sister had not anticipated "this catastrophe now, nor prepared her "mind for it." See vi. 104, 5, which seems not much amiss: but I have referred, with approbation, to Koen on Corinthus upon Dialects; and that book I sent home, to my house in the town, a few days ago.

The imperfect state of the Æneid is sufficiently clear from the hemistichs, little

inconsistencencies, and inaccuracies, which the author would certainly have corrected; but this imperfection might have been indubitably inferred from his own dying directions for its destruction; a piece of history, which never admitted, to my recollection, of any controversy. Quintilian, I presume, by his *æqualitate pensamus*, means to intimate, that Virgil, if he have not taken such lofty flights as Homer, never approaches so near the ground, nor degrades himself by the puerilities and coarsenesses of his master.

I have no Virgil here, which contains Servius; but you may consult him on the *quid dulce meum*, and see what the Antients collected from that expression.

As to your passage from Sophocles τί βλεπω, βλ are *not* those consonants before which the Tragedians *shorten* syllables.

I call the part of Æn. xi. which finishes the story of Pallas, the *epilogue*, in the rhetorical meaning of the term; for the *lamentable* termination of his warfare. The

επιλογος was that portion of the oration which was devoted to *commiseration* only; and as this was the *conclusion*, the term gained the secondary sense, afterwards, of *conclusion* in general. A beautiful passage in Longinus owes its excellence to this primary and proper use of the word, perceived by no editor before Toup: where Longinus, in speaking of those parts in the Odyssey which relate the death of Antilochus and the other Grecian chiefs, in allusion also to the νεκυομαντεια, calls that poem the *epilogue* of the Iliad; i. e. the *funeral oration*, as it were, of those heroes whose *living adventures* had been celebrated in the former poem.

Certainly Æn. x. 515, 516, are highly spirited; and the vivacity of the conceptions is well delineated by the rapidity of the composition, unfettered by copulatives, and unretarded by epithets. The second Æneid, abating those exceptions of Sinon and Laocoön, is incomparable. The exordium is most dignified and solemn, as well

as natural and pathetic to perfection; and what follows the introduction to the havoc of the Greeks, after issuing from their retreat, exhibits, to my fancy—in an adequate display of events, the most awful and affecting, of the most turbulent and soft emotions—all the capacities of human genius.

With respect to imitation, much may be said on so copious a subject. The uniformity of Nature supplies, of course, those thoughts which inevitably suggest themselves to every contemplator, but which become the *property* of the *first occupant;* so that sameness and similarity often subsist without imitation in reality. Then, as few poets have written without some excellencies, these catch the peculiar attention of every succeeding genius, and are often imperceptibly assimilated with his own ideas, and often borrowed for the purpose of different application or improvement. Virgil's Georgics arose probably from the works of Hesiod and Nicander;

but how much superior to one, and probably to the other? The same of Pope's Rape of the Lock, and many other poems, which would be but ill exchanged for their originals. There is scarcely a verse in Virgil, Milton, and Pope, that does not savour of their predecessors; and yet they will ever be acknowledged as prime artists in Parnassus.

As to Apoll. Rhod. iv. 386, it is rather observable, that Brunck has put into the text his conjecture, which is also yours, εκ δε ΤΕ πατρης· and that I, from observing (as fully shewn in my *Noctes Carcerariæ*) how ΓΕ follows the pronouns, had conjectured on my margin, Αυτικ' εμαι Γ' ελασειαν; and this is confirmed by two Paris MSS.

One reads Tertullian purely for his style and conceptions, not for the pertinency of his argumentation. They were miserable advocates of their own system. Apuleius is to Cicero, and such writers, what Burke, in his most glorious extravagancies, is to Addison or Swift, as to composition.

As to petitions to Parliament, many powerful impediments stand in their way. 1. The political acrimony of the times, which terrifies *some* of independent conditions; and *many*, who subsist by their superiors. 2. The general and constitutional indifference of the *majority* in all societies, who prefer indolence with suffering, to the chance of redress from exertion and activity. 3. The more extended speculations of some, who cannot acquiesce in those formalities of language, respecting Royalty and Parliaments, which commonly enter into these petitions. 4. The expense, more or less, of such efforts, which usually falls on a few; and on whom the demands of all sorts, for money, have been pressing and frequent during the war, in consequence of their principles. My experience and connections have led me to some knowledge of these matters. I have a Brother at Nottingham, who is a prime mover in all business of a public nature, whether political or benevolent, to an

extent, and with an estimation among his townsmen, with which, I believe, no private individual in this country can compare: and my own actual observation agrees with his reports. 5. The tricks in counteracting, and counter-petitioning, are innumerable, and too successful.

As to the prisoners here, not a man among them but would be reformed to a certainty, by good instruction from those who proved themselves kindly interested in their welfare by their actions: and it is most afflicting to see them sentenced by the Justices to one, two, &c. to *seven* years, for the veriest trifles, if all the circumstances of their condition be considered. Time, and the necessity of endurance, will blunt the acutest sensations of the heart; but the miseries sustained by these unhappy people, without one effort of instruction and reformation, in the midst of keen hunger (which the prison allowance leaves in painful exertion unremittingly), when I first

came among them, prest down my spirit to the earth:

Κλαιον ενι λεχεεσσι καθημενος, ουδε νυ μοι κηρ
Ηθελ' ετι ζωειν, και ορᾳν φαος ηελιοιο.

As to διοισεται in Soph. Aj. 511. I see, from my margin, that Suidas touches on the word; but I have no Suidas here, nor any Sophocles with Notes or Scholia. The sense of the word however, if you do not look too far, but consider only its simple energy, is most satisfactory and evident. Διαφερω is essentially and literally *to carry through*; and, in the middle voice, *to carry one's self through*. "How then, when for-"saken by you, will he carry himself "through *(get himself through—go through*, "i. e. life), under guardians of unkindly "manners and affections?"

I remain, Sir,

Yours respectfully,

GILBERT WAKEFIELD.

LETTER LVII.

FROM MR. FOX TO MR. WAKEFIELD.

SIR, St. Anne's Hill, June 5, 1801.

I was called to town upon business just after the receipt of your last Letter; and partly by going backwards and forwards, partly by company here, I have been so taken up, that I have had little time to myself. But if I do not write now, I think, by my computation, that I shall scarcely have an opportunity of directing another Letter to Dorchester Gaol. I am much obliged for the great quantity of information which your latter Letters have given me; but at this moment have only time to notice one or two points. βλ, you tell me (and I doubt not but you are right), are not two letters before which the Tragedians make vowels short. I was led to suppose they were,

from τλ, κλ, πλ, θλ, χλ, φλ, being undoubtedly of that description. Your information diminishes considerably the number of instances which had occurred to me, against Porson's dictum, in his Note upon Orestes, v. 61. If γλ and γν are taken from me, it will be diminished still more: but even then I have some instances remaining; and have no doubt, upon reading with that view, of finding many more, as those I had collected were entirely by chance. For the present, take two: Medea, 216, and Euripides' Electra, 1058. Upon looking again at Medea's speech, in the fourth book of Apollonius, I doubt whether ἠε be not used, ver. 357, in nearly the same way as Brunck, when he puts the note of interrogation, supposes it to be, ver. 380; and yet I can conceive *or*, by an ellipsis of *the sense*, to have a meaning in ver. 357 which it cannot have in ver. 380.

I sincerely congratulate you, upon your being arrived so near to the end of a confinement which I shall ever consider to

have been as disgraceful to the Government of the Country, as it has been honourable to you.

Your obedient servant,

C. J. Fox.



LETTER LVIII.

FROM THE SAME TO THE SAME.

DEAR SIR, St. Anne's Hill, June 17, 1801.

Fenton, in a sort of note prefixed to his translation of Sappho to Phaon, says, that we learn from the Antients, that Phaon was an old mariner restored to youth by Venus. In Burman's Ovid there is a note from Egnatius, referring to some other work of his (Egnatius's) upon the subject; and there is some reference too, in my Variorum Ovid, to Ælian's Various History, which I have not. This is not a very important subject of inquiry; but I own I have a sort

of curiosity concerning this history of Phaon, which if you can instruct me how to gratify, you will much oblige me.

I sincerely hope you are better satisfied with the state of your Son's health, than you seemed to be when you were here. If accident (I hope not of the same sort as the last) should bring you again this way, I flatter myself you will make me a longer visit.

I am, Dear Sir,

Yours ever,

C. J. Fox.

LETTER LIX.

FROM MR. WAKEFIELD TO MR. FOX.

DEAR SIR, Hackney, August 12, 1801.

I HOPE, in no long time, to be able to consult my books, with a view of answering the queries in your last favour; as I have taken a house in Charter-House Square, to which I expect to remove by the latter end of next week.

There is, at a Bookseller's in Oxford Street, a large-paper Brunck's Apollonius Rhodius, price eighteen shillings. The book is become so scarce as not to be procured in common paper; but I could not determine whether you would choose a finer copy, or I would have secured it for you.

I am, Sir,

Your respectful and obliged friend,

GILBERT WAKEFIELD.

LETTER LX.

FROM THE SAME TO THE SAME.

DEAR SIR, St. Anne's Hill, August 21, 1801.

ON my return hither yesterday, from a short excursion, I found your Letter, with its inclosure, which I return. It is a piece of *news* to me (that would be very agreeable, if it were true), that I have *finished* an historical work. That I have begun one, is true; and that I have had numerous applications relative to the publishing, is equally so: and I should be obliged to you, if you would give the same answer to Mr. Phillips, that I have given to other applicants; which is, that I do not mean to decide on the mode of publication, much less upon the bookseller to be employed, till the work is nearly finished; and till that time I wish to remain entirely unfettered by any promise or engagement.

The hard usage Mr. P. experienced at Leicester would certainly incline me, at any time, to do him a good office, if it were in my power.

I should be very glad to have the copy you mention of Brunck's Apollonius; and if you had mentioned the name of the bookseller, in Oxford Street, where it is, I would have written to him. If you have an opportunity, I will trouble you to bid him send it me by the stage, and I will remit him the price.

I have found, since I wrote to you, a great deal about Phaon, by looking into Bayle, who referred me to Lucian; a note in Heyne's Virgil, which I found at Woburn, and Palæphatus, which I have not seen, but from whom there are extracts, in some of the books I have looked into, containing, as I suppose, all he says upon the subject.

I observe, in Brunck's Analecta, which I have lately purchased, that he takes no notice of the doubts concerning the authen-

ticity of the Remains of Anacreon. I have always supposed them modern; but I understand there has been discovered a Manuscript which proves them to be of a certain degree of antiquity, or at least not a forgery of H. Stephens. The style of them appears to me *very* modern; but yet, that preserved in A. Gellius bears a strong resemblance to some of the others. As to their being really Anacreon's, I should require very strong evidence to satisfy me.

Yours ever,

C. J. Fox.

R. WATTS, Printer, Broxbourne.